Tentamen Novum Continuatum.

OR, AN

ANSWER

TO

Mr *OWEN*'s Plea and Defence.

WHEREIN

Biſhop *Pearſon*'s Chronology about the time of St. *Paul*'s Conſtituting *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and *Titus* of *Crete*, is confirm'd; the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy* Demonſtrated to have been written in the Apoſtle's latter Impriſonment at *Rome*; and all Mr. *Owen*'s Arguments drawn from Antiquity for *Presbyterian Parity* and *Ordination* by *Presbyters*, are overthrown.

Herein is more particularly prov'd,

THAT

The Church of *England*, ever ſince the Reformation, believ'd the Divine Right of Biſhops.

By *THOMAS GIPPS*, Rector of *Bury* in *Lancaſhire*.

Εἴ τις διδάσκοι τὸν οἶκον Θεοῦ εὐκαταφρόνητον εἶναι καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ συνάξεις, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάζοι μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Con. Gang. Can. 5. & 6.

LONDON,

Printed by *Tho. Warren*, for *Ephraim Johnſon* Bookſeller in *Mancheſter*, 1699.

Linc

H.1.34

Tentamen Novum Continuatum.

OR AN

ANSWER

TO

Mr OWEN's Plea and Defence.

WHEREIN

Bishop *Pearson's* Chronology about the time of St. *Paul's* Constituting *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and *Titus* of *Crete*, is confirm'd; the second Epistle to *Timothy* Demonstrated to have been written in the Apostle's last Imprisonment at *Rome*; and all Mr. *Owen's* Arguments drawn from Antiquity for *Presbyterian Parity* and *Ordination* by *Presbyters*, are over thrown.

Herein is more [illegible] prov'd,

That

The Church of *England*, at [illegible] Reformation, believ'd the Divine Right of Bishops.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

By THOMAS GIPPS, Rector of *Bury* in *Lancashire*.

[illegible]

LONDON,

Printed by *Tho. Warren*, for *Ephraim Johnson* Bookseller in *Manchester*, 1699.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

T*Here has been Two Books publiſh'd by Mr.* James Owen *Miniſter of a ſeparate Congregation at* Oſweſtry, *which I am under an Obligation and Promiſe of Replying unto. The* Plea for Scripture Ordination, *and the* Tutamen Evangelicum alias Defence of the Plea. *And though the time of their Publication might juſtly Require me to conſider* the Plea *in the firſt Place, yet the Nature of the Argument forces me to Invert that Order, and to begin with* the Defence. *The Reaſon whereof is this. I had ſet out a ſmall Book Entituled* Tentamen Novum, *or a new Eſſay proving the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, the which engaged me to Anſwer ſome few things in* the Plea, *which concern that part of the Controverſy between the Diſſenters, and us of the Eſtabliſh'd Church, viz.* The Scripture *Evidence. Hereupon* Mr. *O. Printed his* Defence, *endeavouring therein to overthrow my Hypotheſis in the* Tentamen Novum, *and to Vindicate the old one by the Word of God. It is therefore neceſſary I ſhould firſt of all Reply unto* the Defence, *that is, clear my Point about the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, and alſo manifeſt the Inconſiſtency of the old Hypotheſis with the Scripture; and thence deſcend to his numerous Teſtimonies drawn out of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, in behalf of Presbyterian Parity which will be a full and proper Anſwer to his* Plea. *Accordingly I have caſt this Book into two Parts: The firſt contains a Reply to the* Defence, *except a few Teſtimonies of Antiquity, which are more Regularly reſerv'd to the ſecond Part, wherein I anſwer his Plea.*

In the management of this work the Reader muſt not expect that I ſhould follow my Adverſary κατ' πόδας *ſtep by ſtep, in all the Sallies he has made into points nothing at all appertaining to the Preſent Controverſy, and involve my ſelf into new Diſputes before the Old one be done with. My purpoſe is to keep cloſe to the Game, and not to run after every freſh Hare,* Mr. O. *is pleaſed to ſtart. This would be an endleſs piece of Work, and ſwell this Book unto an Intolerable Bulk, which I deſign to draw into as narrow Compaſs as I poſſibly can, and as the unreaſonable Cavils of my Adverſary will permit.*

Nor will I trouble my ſelf or my Reader to take notice of all thoſe ſnarling and ill-natured Reflections which the Defence *abounds with, without any Occaſion given by me, that I am ſenſible of. 'Tis much better to neglect them, than weary my ſelf and others*

with

with Impertinent and Abuſive Raillery, which betrays the weakneſs of the Writer or his Cauſe, and hurts no Body, but the man from whom it proceeds. Mat. 15. 18.

Nevertheleſs it will be neceſſary to remove ſome little of the Rubbiſh of both kinds out of the way, leſt haply the World may be tempted to ſuſpect me as Ignorant and my Performances as weak as my Adverſary has all along repreſented 'em. But when I have Vindicated my ſelf in a few of the moſt material things of that Nature (if there be any ſuch) the Ingenuous Reader will I hope be perſwaded that I am able, if I were as willing, to diſcharge my ſelf of the moſt trivial matters that are to be met with in the Defence. *Only let it be noted that I intend not to mix theſe By-Diſputes with the main Argument, which would be perplext thereby, and become more obſcure; but to caſt them into an Appendix by themſelves at the end of every Chapter, as a ſeparated Entertainment unto thoſe, who ſhall have the Curioſity and Leiſure to conſult 'em, and which may be eaſily laid aſide by ſuch as have no Mind to trouble themſelves with unneceſſary Squabbles.*

In my Reply to the Defence *and Vindication of my Hypotheſis as alſo to the* Plea, *I will not concern my ſelf with the Opinions of Modern Authors, how Eminent ſoever they were or ſtill are in the Church; that is I will not be ſway'd or governed by them farther than my own reaſon conducted by the Word of God ſhall convince me. I am ſenſible that moſt (if not all) of the former writers engaged in this Controverſy about Epiſcopal Government, even many of the Epiſcopal party as well as the Diſſenters for want of duly examining, and underſtanding the Time of* Paul's beſeeching *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus, have run themſelves into ſuch Labyrinths and Abſurdities, that a Man might juſtly wonder they could ever ſit down quietly and content themſelves with their own Sentiments and Explications. I am verily perſwaded there is not one Man in the World, that will allow himſelf the freedom of thinking, but would ſubſcribe unto that Learned Prelate* Dr. Pearſon's *Judgment in this cauſe, after 'tis once fully and fairly repreſented to him, except only ſuch as are captivated by ſome powerful Intereſt, ſecret Pride, inveterate prejudice, or the Deſign of upholding a party. Where theſe evil Affections Rule and Domineer, Truth will not be able to prevail.* Non ſuaſeris etiamſi perſuaſeris. *Of this we have had a Notorious Inſtance of another kind in the preſent Age, when Dr.* Harvey *had Diſcovered and invincibly Demonſtrated the Circulation of the Blood, almoſt all the Naturaliſts and Phyſitians in the World, even thoſe of the firſt Form with open Mouth decry'd both the Author and his Doctrine: And when the truth had by Degrees forc'd its way, and gained Ground upon the greateſt part of them, then Envy ſteps in and would have ſnatch'd the Lawrels from the Brow of that Immortal Philoſopher and Phyſitian. How many of the Ancients were alledged to have known the Circulation of the Blood? And* Solomon *before was not ignorant of it, as ſome have endeavoured to prove from the 12th Chap. of his Eccleſiaſtes. So hard a thing it is to bring Men off their old Mumpſimus and reconcile 'em to the Truth, when it appears in the Shape of Novelty, or to do Juſtice unto thoſe who have had the good hap to find her out. But to return to my buſineſs.*

Mr. O. *in his* Plea *cited ſome* Hundreds *of Authorities in favour of Preſbyterian* Parity *and Ordination. My deſign is not (as I ſaid) to meddle with thoſe, which are collect'd out of Private and Modern Writers. All that is needful for me to do, is to conſider the Primitive the Councils, eſpecially the General ones, the Fathers and other Antient Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and the practice of the moſt Flouriſhing Catholick Churches of old unto the 5th Century incluſively, and to examine whether my Adverſary has drawn any one good Teſtimony for Himſelf and Brethren, out of theſe Monuments of Antiquity.*

To the READER.

Timothy. If he be not (as I hope will be made appear) there is an end of his Plea (I ſuppoſe) eſpecially, when ſuch a Cloud of witneſſes which of neceſſity fall in our way as we Travel through the Hiſtory of thoſe times, will riſe up againſt him within the Compaſs of the 4 or 5 firſt Ages aforeſaid.

Before I make an end of this Preface, I thought it needful to prepare the Reader with a ſhort account of my whole Hypotheſis, which if kept in Memory as he goes will be ſome eaſe and advantage to him. He muſt remember then, that all Authors I know of (except haply the Rhemiſts who ſo far as I ſee ſpeak but at Random) writing upon the Preſent Subject or commenting upon the firſt Epiſtle to Timothy, have aſſerted or at leaſt taken for granted (till very lately) that the time of St. Paul's beſeeching Timothy to abide at Epheſus, when he went into Macedonia, is ſomewhere to be ſearch'd for in the Acts of the Apoſtles, before St. Paul bid the Epheſian Elders Farewel in Acts 20. v. 17. from whence our Adverſaries conclude, that the ſupreme Government of the Church of Epheſus, was not in that Epiſtle committed unto Timothy: For that the Apoſtle could not have ſo wholly overlook'd their Biſhop in that Farewel Sermon, and applied himſelf only to the Elders, to whom he commended the care and overſight of that Church.

On the other hand I have ſhew'd that the firſt Epiſtle to Timothy was wrote long after Paul's ſaid Farewel Sermon, even after his enlargement out of his former Impriſonment at Rome; and by conſequence, that he beſought Timothy to abide at Epheſus, when he went unto Macedonia, at another time, than what has hitherto been believ'd and aſſigned. And ſo that Objection juſt now mentioned quite vaniſhes.

Thus then my Hypotheſis lies. After that Schiſm at Corinth had been in ſome meaſure though not intirely allay'd by St. Paul, he with all haſt made towards Jeruſalem taking Miletum in his way, where he bad the Epheſian Elders Farewel. At Jeruſalem he was impriſoned and thence ſent to Rome in Bonds. Here he continued two years and upwards writing Epiſtles to the ſeveral Churches, of Epheſus, of Philippi, of Coloſs, of Judea, and to Philemon. Being at length ſet at Liberty, and in his way as he went back Eaſtward to viſit the foreſaid Churches, he laid the Foundation of a Church in Crete, leaving Titus behind to finiſh and to govern it. Thence as I ſuppoſe he proſecuted his Journey to Judea, Heb. 13. 23. and thence as it were, back again through Syria to Aſia. Being at Troas (2 Tim. 4. 13.) about to paſs into Macedonia, he beſought Timothy to abide at Epheſus. Shortly after, when in Macedonia haply or Greece or ſomewhere thereabouts, he wrote this firſt Epiſtle to Timothy giving him the neceſſary Orders, how he was to behave himſelf in the Charge lately committed to him; and not long after from Nicopolis, that Epiſtle to Titus upon the ſame Subject. Henceforward we hear no more of him in Scripture ſaving that being once again got to Rome, he thence wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy as is undeniably evinc'd in theſe Papers.

The Corinthian Schiſm, like the Leproſy, ſeemed incurable, and ſpread its ſelf unto other Churches alſo, particularly Epheſus, as may be gathered from the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, and the firſt to Timothy: And the like I reckon to have happened in other places alſo. Wherefore Paul in his Viſitation of the Eaſtern Churches before ſpoken of, his Principal deſign (I preſume) was to compoſe the Contentions already riſen, and to prevent them for the future. To which end he committed the Government of the Churches to ſingle Perſons, of Crete to Titus, of Epheſus to Timothy: The like being to be believed of the Reſt of the Apoſtles, and Churches throughout the World: For how elſe could there have been Biſhops every where, as Ignatius writes to the Epheſians, and [illegible] not

not one Church at that time governed by a Presbytery of Elders only without an Apoſtle, or Biſhop preſiding over them, that we can find in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory?

Nor are we to imagin this a perfectly new device taken up by Paul, *and the other Apoſtles meerly upon the Occaſion of the Schiſms at* Corinth *and elſewhere. For as I make account they came to this Reſolution among themſelves even at the beginning, viz. to commit the Government of the Churches unto ſingle Perſons: Not that they immediately did ſo aſſoon as they had made the Decree: For every Apoſtle ('tis likely) kept the Government, and Care of the Churches by him founded in his own Hands, ſo long as he thought fit and was able to manage them himſelf: So that every Church was not caſt into this Platform, nor furniſh'd with a Biſhop diſtinct from the Apoſtles at the ſame inſtant; but 'twas done* paulatim, *as* Jerom *ſpeaks in his Commentary on* Titus. James *was Biſhop of* Jeruſalem, *before the* Corinthian *Schiſm,* Titus *of* Crete, *at that Church's firſt Plantation, though* Timothy *was not ſo of* Epheſus, *till many Years after the* Epheſian *Church had been formed. But at length becauſe Schiſms began now to increaſe, and prevail, the Apoſtles taking the Alarm haſten'd to put their former Decree into Execution, and more eſpecially becauſe at this time believers were multiplyed, Churches were increaſed, buſineſs grew on their Hands, and they forced to be long Abſent and unable to inſpect all Churches: As alſo becauſe the time of their Departure now drew on apace, 'twas therefore high time, and neceſſary to provide for the Peace and future Government of the Church, as they had in the beginning contrived.*

Whereas then I have frequently expreſs'd my ſelf as if the Church Government had been alter'd *from what it was in the Infancy of Chriſtianity, and leſt this ſhould be taken for a raſh and dangerous Conceſſion to the Adverſaries in prejudice of Epiſcopacy, I thus explain my ſelf.* 1. *This was not a Change of the firſt Principle and Rule of Government, but only a bringing it by Degrees to that Model and Frame, which the Apoſtles (as I ſaid) firſt pitched upon, and afterward, as Occaſion required, by degrees brought to perfection. So that with reſpect to the Original deſign and Scheme of Government there was indeed no* change *or Innovation at all. But then,* 2. *If we conſider matter of Fact, there was an* Alteration *of Government, in as much as the Apoſtles having left it for a while unto the Presbyters, to diſcharge the Ordinary affairs of the Churches in their Abſence, but ſtill reſerving to themſelves the Power of Ordination, and other matters of greateſt Moment, at length conſtituted Biſhops over them, purſuant to their Prime Reſolution and in Conformity to their own way of Government, which was* Prelatical. *In this latter Senſe I would always be underſtood; and this* Change *was nothing elſe but an improvement and compleating the Church Government, as it had been from the beginning projected by themſelves or rather ſuggeſted to them by the Holy Ghoſt.*

I muſt alſo here take notice of one thing more, which is not ſufficiently explained in its proper place. It being acknowledg'd that Presbyters were ſubject and accountable unto the Apoſtles, and by Conſequence (as I argu'd) not Supreme Governours of the Churches, Mr. O. *retorts that Timothy and Titus,* and all Biſhops alſo in the Apoſtles Days were ſo; and by the ſame conſequence not Supreme Governours. *But I anſwer.*

1. *'Tis true* Timothy *and* Titus *(*Paul *being alive) were ſubject and accountable to him, and ſo not abſolutely Supreme Rulers, if we look up towards the Apoſtles, but if we look downward to the Presbyters they were Supreme, or which is the ſame to my purpoſe Superiour to the Presbyters, who were ſubject to the Biſhops.* 2. Timothy *and* Titus *were not (in* Paul's *life time) actually Supreme Governours, as if they had no Superiour; for* Paul *was over them: True! Yet they were Supreme, intentionally even*

whilſt

whilſt the Apoſtle was alive and actually after his deceaſe. For ſo they muſt needs of courſe be. 3. *There is a great difference between* Timothy *and* Titus *ſubjection, and accountableneſs unto the Apoſtles, and that of the Presbyters. The Presbyters (as I have ſhew'd and as far as we know) did nothing without the expreſs command and ſpecial direction of the Apoſtles, I mean in the higher and moſt important buſineſs of the Churches: But* Timothy *and* Titus *(and ſo the reſt) had general Rules only preſcrib'd 'em, and were Ordinarily left to their own Diſcretionary Power in the Execution of them, as is evident from the Epiſtles to* Timothy *and* Titus, *except the Apoſtle in an extraordinary manner interpoſed ſometimes, as we may reaſonably admit. But there is* nec vola nec veſtigium, *no footſteps in the whole Scripture of any ſuch general Rules and diſcretionary Power committed to the Presbyters as is evinc'd in* T. N. *and theſe Papers.*

Jan. 1.
169$\frac{7}{8}$.

THE

THE CONTENTS

PART I.

Chap. I. SEveral Cavils againſt the Church of England conſidered — Page 1
Chap. II. Id. — p. 6
Chap. III. Id. — p. 19
Chap. IV. The Old Chronology about the time of St. Paul's ſettling Timothy Ruler of the Church of Epheſus overthrown, the Pearſonian Hypotheſis more firmly eſtabliſhed, and the ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy demonſtrated, to have been written in the Apoſtles latter Bonds at Rome — p. 29
Chap. V. Sundry Objections are Anſwered, and particularly 'tis here proved, that the Convocation is and ought to be allow'd as a juſt Repreſentative of the Church of England — p. 57
Chap. VI. Being an Anſwer to Mr. O's 6th Chap. — p. 72

PART II.

Chap. I. OF Clemens Romanus — p. 3
Chap. II. Of Ignatius's Epiſtles — p. 10
Chap. III. Of Mark and the Church of Alexandria — p. 20
Chap. IV. Of the Syriac Verſion — p. 30
Chap. V. Of the beginning of Chriſtianity in the moſt remote North-Weſt parts of Scotland — p. 32
Chap. VI. Of ſome Paſſages in St. Cyprian — p. 43
Chap. VII. Of the Scythian Church — p. 47
Chap. VIII. Of the Chorepiſcopi — p. 50
Chap. IX. Of the firſt Synod of Nice — p. 55
Chap. X. Of Aerius — p. 69
Chap. XI. Of Hilary the Deacon — p. 70
Chap. XII. Of Jerom — p. 74
Chap. XIII. Of the Carthaginian Councils — p. 84
Chap. XIV. Of Paphnutius and Daniel — p. 89
Chap. XV. Of Pope Leo — p. 91
Chap. XVI. Of the Church in the Iſland Taprobane — p. 93
Chap. XVII. Of Pelagius his Ordination — p. 95
Chap. XVIII. Of the Waldenſes, Boiarians, &c. — p. 98
Chap. XIX. Of the Church of England at and ſince the Reformation — p. 102

PART

PART I.

CHAP. I.

In Anſwer to Mr. O's 1ſt Chap.

THE Rector in his Preface to the *T. N.* complained of the unfair way which the Diſſenters have taken up in managing Controverſies, that is, of their bringing in other matter, nothing at all belonging to the Point in debate; which is as when a Lawyer, when he is pleading the Cauſe of his Client, and ſetting forth his Title unto the Eſtate in Queſtion, ſhould fall foul upon his Clients Adverſary, expoſing his Perſon and upbraiding him with his private, perhaps, but ſuppos'd Faults and Infirmities. I inſtanc'd in three things, which are the common *Topicks* of the Diſſenters railing againſt the Epiſcopal Clergy, and which they will be ſure to hook in, whatever the Matter in Controverſy be. But if recrimination be but cavilling (as one of their own Authors ſpeaks) much more impertinent Accuſing. My Inſtances were, That the Epiſcopal Divines are Arminians, That the Church of *England* Symbolizes with the Papiſts; That the Biſhops are *proud Lords, and Lordly Prelates.* And if all this were true, what does it ſignify in the Queſtion about Church-Government?

Mr. O. In the Contents of his firſt *Chap.* at the beginning, Advertiſes his Reader, that, *The Diſſenters are juſtified in their way of manaaging Controverſies.* Indeed he ſhould have edeavour'd it; if he would have anſwer'd to the purpoſe, and his way of Vindicating the Diſſenters, ſhould have been (I conceive) either to deny the charge laid againſt 'em, or elſe to juſtify the fitneſs and reaſonableneſs of that way of controverting. But inſtead of this, he falls upon the old ſtrain of accuſing us (the Rector) of Arminianiſm, of Symbolizing with Papiſts, and the Biſhops for being *Lords*, which is nothing to the Queſtion between him and me here, *viz. Whether it be fair to charge ones Adverſary with ſuppoſed faults, which have no relation to the Queſtion in hand*, unleſs he is ſo vain as to imagin, that his own repeated practice, is a ſufficient juſtification of the Diſſenters managing Controverſies.

In giving an Account of the Nature of our Church-Government, I obſerv'd in general, *That our Epiſcopal Government is eſtabliſh'd upon certain Canons and Laws, made and conſented unto by the Convocation, conſiſting of Biſhops and Presbyters, and by the multitude of Believers; That is, by their Repreſentatives in Parliament, and that, thus it was in the Council of Jeruſalem*, Acts 15. This is plain matter of Fact, and one would have thought incapable of being cavill'd at; and yet Mr. *Owen* who is a Maſter at that knack, has many things to oppoſe me in it, and has found many diſparities in the Reſemblance. As,

1. He affirms that, *The Apoſtles, &c.* at Jeruſalem *enjoined the neceſſary forbearance of a few things: but the Convocation has made Canons enjoining the practice of unneceſſary things, to create offence.* *Def.* p. 24.

Anſ.

Anſ. Theſe laſt words are as Malicious, as falſe, and without ground. How can *Mr O.* at this diſtance tell, or how could the Diſſenters of thoſe times know, that the Deſign of the Convocation was to *create offence?* Has he, or had they the gift of *diſcerning Spirits*? Or dare they preſume to lay claim to one of the Tranſcendent Attributes of God; his Omniſcience and knowing the Secrets of Mens Hearts?

The things enjoyn'd by the Apoſtles (excepting Fornication) were not neceſſary before they were enjoyn'd, but only Charitably and Prudentially neceſſary: And ſo our few Ceremonies too were and ſtill are, Charitably and Prudentially neceſſary, which was the Reaſon of their being enjoin'd at firſt, and ſtill continu'd amongſt us.

The Council of *Jeruſalem* did not *widen the door of Church-Fellowſhip* (as *Mr. O.* aſſerts) but made it ſtraighter, if the matters here ſpoken of, can be ſaid to belong unto Church-Fellowſhip. The Gentile Believers had a Natural right to *eat blood, things ſtrangled, and things offer'd unto Idols*, when ſold in the Market: But the Apoſtles depriv'd 'em of this Liberty, commanding them to Symbolize with the Jews in the forbearance of 'em. And I would know a Reaſon, why in a few matters of Indifference, Decency and Solemnity, it is not Lawful for the Church-Governours, now to reſtrain the Liberty of Believers: I ſay in ſome few things out of Charity to many Foreign Proteſtants, who have Ceremonies, and to the Primitive Chriſtians, which were not without 'em, even as the Apoſtles reſtrain'd the Liberty of the Gentile Believers in Charity to the Jews? And why is it not as Lawful for us to Symbolize with the Primitive Chriſtians, and our Foreign Brethren-Proteſtants, as the Apoſtles with the Jews.

2. *Mr. O.* goes on, *The Council of* Jeruſalem *freed the Chriſtians from the Yoke of Circumciſion.*

Anſ. But it put on them thoſe three *Yokes* aforeſaid. Beſides as the Apoſtles freed the Chriſtians from Circumciſion; or rather declar'd them free from it: for they were never under that bondage: ſo did the Convocation free us from all Superſtition and Idolatry.

3. "The Apoſtles (he adds) aſſerted that Chriſtian Liberty, which Jeſus "Chriſt purchaſed and obliged us to maintain, *Gal.* 5. 1.

Anſ. And yet the Apoſtles took away the Gentiles Liberty in the things aforemention'd. The Text of Scripture here cited, has a falſe conſtruction put upon it. The Liberty there ſpoken of, is not a Liberty not to do any thing, which is in its own Nature indifferent, no not a Liberty from all the ſmaller Obſervations of the Law; for then the Apoſtles could not have enjoin'd the forbearance of the three things, nor could *Paul* have Preach'd and Urg'd, the obſervation of thoſe Decrees, as he did, *Acts* 16. 4. But 'tis the Liberty from
Gal. 5. *v.* 3. the bondage of Circumciſion, which made Men *Debtors to the whole Law*, and to every Ceremony thereof.

Def. p. 25. 4. He complains of the number of our Canons, whereas (ſays he) *the Apoſtles at* Jeruſalem *made none new, and continued but a few which were obliging before.*

Anſ. That theſe three Canons made by the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*, were new to the Gentile Believers, is out of all queſtion, tho' *Mr. O.* affirms the contrary; not new, as if they had never been known or heard of before; but they were, I ſay, new to the Gentile Believers, who were not before oblig'd to the obſerva-

tion of'em, tho' *Mr. O.* ſays they were. But whereas the Apoſtles at *Feruſalem* continued (made) *but a few Canons* ; 'tis true: nevertheleſs at other times, and at other places, they might have made more than threeſcore for any thing we know. The code of the Univerſal Church, conſiſts of two Hundred and ſeven Canons: yet they were made at ſeveral times, and in ſeveral Places: Even ſo, though the Apoſtles at this time and at *Feruſalem*, made but three Canons, yet at other times, and in other places they might have made more, and did ſo, as we may Learn from 1 *Cor.* 7. wherein (I think) we meet with ſeveral Canons, as from thoſe words of St. *Paul, The reſt will I ſet in order when I come*, 1 Cor. 11. 14. And again, *Hold the Traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epiſtle.* 2 Theſ. 2. 15. *That thou ſhouldeſt ſet in order the things that are wanting*, Tit. 1. 5. See *Juſtellus.*

But 5. The Apoſtles (ſays *Mr. O.*) " Annexed no *Anathema's* nor Excommu-
" nications againſt the breaker of their Canons, they only concluded 'em with
" theſe gentle words, *from which if you keep your ſelves, ye ſhall do well.*

Anſ. Well! and the Gentile Believers readily obey'd the Apoſtles Decrees without more ado, not ſtubbornly clamouring for *that Liberty wherewith Chriſt had made 'em free.* For Chriſt had made the Gentile Chriſtians free from the three Canons of the Apoſtles, as well as from Circumciſion. But *doing well* was an effectual motive in thoſe days unto Obedience, though not in theſe Licentious Times of ours. If the puniſhment annext unto Canons be now more ſevere than ordinary, it is becauſe ſome Men are more Stiff and Refractory, more Diſobedient and Unpeaceable than the Gentile Believers were of old.

6. *Mr. O.* adds, *The Canons of Feruſalem were made by the Apoſtles, Elders and the whole Church: But ours by the Biſhops and Presbyters in Convocation, which are the true Church of England by repreſentation*, by which he thinks to deſtroy the parallel, becauſe the Multitude of Believers were not preſent at the making our Canons, as they were at the making of thoſe at *Feruſalem.* To obviate this Exception, I obſerv'd that our Canons were conſented unto, or confirmed and receiv'd, by the Multitude of Believers, that is, by their repreſentatives in Parliament. But *Mr. O.* having nothing elſe to cavil at, or wherewith he might invalidate the Parallel, which is ſo much to the advantage of our Church, and fatal to the Diſſenters, corrupts my words, and by way of gloſs adds, *To the Multitude of Believers, that is* (ſays he) *the Church.* I ſay, and ſay it again, that the Parliament repreſents the Multitude of Believers, but I never ſaid, *That is the Church*, nor any thing like it. This Invention was hammer'd out at *Mr. O*'s own Forge, whence an abundance of the ſame kind have been uttered. All the colour he has for thus miſrepreſenting me, is, that *I make the Biſhops to anſwer the Apoſtles, the Presbyters, the Elders*; therefore I muſt make *the Parliament to anſwer the whole Church.* And ſo I do: yet this will do *Mr. O.* no ſervice. For that expreſſion, *The whole Church*, in the 15th of *Act.* 22. is not ſo exact, but will need a little explanation on this Occaſion. Theſe words then the *Whole Church* cannot be underſtood ſtrictly: for the *whole Church* here muſt be diſtinguiſh'd from the Apoſtles and Elders: but ſurely theſe alſo were part of the whole Church properly ſpeaking. The words then are meant of the *Multitude of Believers* (they are call'd the *Multitude*, v. 12.) and in contradiſtinction to the Apoſtles and Elders, and therefore I avoided ſaying, *The whole Church*, and choſe to expreſs my ſelf thus. *The Multitude of Believers*, I am, then I flatter

my ſelf pretty ſafe from *Mr. O.* and my Dioceſan too, were he (what he is far from being) the moſt ſevere and haughty Prelate in Chriſtendom.

Becauſe it is a common Objection againſt the Church of *England's* Conſtitution, that *Pariſh Prieſts have no power of Diſcipline,* I aſſerted that, *They have power to rebuke and admoniſh, and to ſuſpend for a while from the Lord's Supper.*

Def. p. 26. *And ſo* (ſays Mr. O.) *have private Perſons power to rebuke and admoniſh,* Lev. 19. 17. Col. 3, 16. As if *Mr. O.* never heard of that common and receiv'd diſtinction between fraternal, private, or charitable Admonition, and that which is publick and Miniſterial, and Authoritative.

“ Well ! but as for our power of ſuſpending, he alledges 'tis but for fourteen “ days, and after that the Sinner is left to the Ordinary.

Ay ! Here we have the bottom of the Diſſenting Miniſters Deſign out. They would be all ſo many little Popes, from whom there lies no appeal. The very Men who decry Tyranny, are ſetting up for Arbitrary Government, and will not endure that in another, which they aſpire to themſelves. All I ſhall reply unto him is, to preſent him with the judgment of *Calvin*, and *Beza*; and I hope *Mr. O.* will lend both his Ears unto theſe two Presbyterian Oracles.

Calv. Ep. 136. The former affirms——*That to truſt Excommunication in the hands of every Parochial Miniſter, and his particular Congregation, is contrary to the Apoſtolick practice*: the latter declares

Bez. Ep. 29. what the Diſcipline at *Geneva* was, *viz. That the Parochial Miniſters proceed no further than Admonition; but in caſe of contumacy, they certify the Presbytery of the City.* It is certain the power of excommunication is in the hands of the Magiſtrates of that City.

Def. p. 27. But *Mr. O.* further objects, “ That we have no power to “ judge whom to Baptize, but muſt Baptize all that are “ offer'd, though Children of Jews, Infidels, Deiſts, &c.

Anſ. This is nothing to the preſent Queſtion between us, which is whether *our Pariſh Prieſts have any Power of Diſcipline.* They may have ſome power, tho' not this. And that they have ſome power, to wit of Miniſterial Admonition, and Suſpenſion from the Lords Supper, has been already aſſerted and prov'd, I preſume, yea, and granted alſo. This then is a new and impertinent Subject, thruſt in here meerly to make a noiſe and duſt with, and to avoid the thorough diſcuſſion of the Point in hand.

2. The Diſſenting Miniſters, have a greater power than we have, or pretend to, 'tis confeſt, *&c.* to refuſe whomſoever they pleaſe, even the Children of the moſt upright Believers. They are reſponſible to no Law, nor to any Superiour that I know of, in caſe of refuſal, nor to any puniſhment. Only perhaps the parties aggriev'd will withdraw their Contributions. But upon theſe terms we alſo have a power to Judge whom we will, and whom we will not Baptize : 'tis but venturing the loſs of our Livings, as they muſt of their Contributions.

3. *Mr. O.* Suppoſes here, what cannot eaſily be believ'd ever did, or will happen, *viz.* that Jewiſh, or Gentile, or Theiſtical Parents, will offer their Children unto Chriſtian Baptiſm, or ſuffer others to bring 'em to that Holy Sacrament.

4. Perhaps the Children of very wicked Chriſtians are brought to be Baptized. Theſe we acknowledge we have not power to refuſe : for ſo we know,

that the Children of wicked Jews were to be admitted unto Circumciſion, in the room whereof our Lord introduc'd Baptiſm: and we are perſwaded the former is the Rule and Pattern of the latter.

5. If it ſhould ſo happen that the Child of a Jew, or Turk, or Infidel, or Heretick Excommunicated, or Theiſt, or Atheiſt ſhould be put into our Hands to be Baptized, 'tis confeſt we take our ſelves oblig'd to Baptize 'em: but 'tis with this *Proviſo*, that there be ſufficient *Suſceptors*, or Perſons who will undertake to bring 'em up in the Chriſtian Religion. And of the ſufficiency of theſe Sureties we are the judges, except an Appeal be made from us unto our Dioceſian, who may over-rule us if he ſees juſt cauſe for it.

6. and Laſtly, How the Apoſtles and Presbyters, in the Apoſtles days manag'd themſelves in the Point of Infant-Baptiſm; *Mr. O.* ſhould have done well, firſt to have ſtated it out of the New Teſtament, before he brought this exception upon the Stage.

Mr. O. further objects—*That we have no power to forbear giving the Eucharist to a Notorious Offender, unleſs we proſecute him in the Biſhops Court.*

Anſ. 1. The Reader may apply the Two firſt Anſwers, to the former Objection unto this, whereby he'll ſee how Frivolous and Impertinent it is.

2. *Mr. O.* Should have excepted thus, *ſave for fourteen days.*

3. It is a moſt falſe and wicked ſaying, that of *Mr. O's*—"That if he be "abſolv'd in the Court, we muſt give him the Euchariſt, though we know "him never ſo Impenitent. We cannot know a Mans impenitency except himſelf declares it, either by his Words or Actions, and continuing in his Sins. In either caſe I can forbear giving him the Lords Supper, and in fourteen days certify as before. Nay, by Canon 109, I am not to admit him to the Lord's Supper, till he is reform'd, and of this I am the Judge.

I cannot deny but this method is *troubleſome*,&c. but it is not *odious* in the Eyes of good Men, nor is it poſſible to be *fruitleſs*, if the Pariſh-Prieſt is reſolute. The Ordinary cannot relieve the Impenitent Sinner, nor compel the Prieſt to admit him. This courſe is indeed rarely undertaken, and that becauſe (as I have experienc'd) if one warn a Wicked Perſon, one that is ſcandalouſly ſo, he'll be ſure not to offer himſelf, leſt he be turn'd back and publickly diſgrac'd in the Face of the Congregation. The method is as I have ſaid troubleſom: but better a miſchief than an inconvenience. Better many Sinners be admited, than one good Man rejected. If the Pariſh Prieſt ſhould have it in his own Power and Breaſt to abſtain, whom he pleas'd, and for as long time as he thought fit without Liberty to appeal, his private Revenge, or the influence of the Parties Enemies, might engage him to deprive a good Man, of the comfort of that Holy Ordinance. I have an Inſtance of this kind ready at hand, a late one, and in my Neighbourhood. "A Member of the Congregation, had given Evidence in "behalf of a Church-Man againſt a Diſſenter. No Body objected againſt his "Teſtimony as falſe, 'Twas thought rather favourable to the Diſſenter. At his "return from the Aſſizes, a Meſſage was brought him by ſome of the Congre-"gation, that he was to forbear coming to the Communion, he was alſo repri-"manded by the Miniſter, for giving Evidence againſt a Brother, the *Sub-pœna* "being not actually, though ready to be ſerv'd upon him, in caſe he refus'd to go "without it. This was not Commutation, I acknowledge, which we hear of ſo oft, but it was baſe Corruption, *and Iniquity to be puniſh'd by the Judge.*

Yet

Yet *Mr. O.* goes on, and tells me——" We have no power to call perſons " to Repentance openly before the Church.

Anſ. As much as *Mr. O.* has. He or I may call 'em to Publick Penance : but 'tis at their choice, whether they will obey us. Such Penitents are but like Mr. *Baxter's* Chriſtians, *meer Volunteers.*

Laſtly, he urges that, *we have no power to judge any Man to be Excommunicated, nor to abſolve 'em.*

Anſ. Mr. O. is ſo fond of the Power of judging, that 'tis a Thouſand pities he was not bred a Lawyer, that ſo in good time he might have been *My Lord Judge* : for I ſuppoſe he has no exception againſt a Temporal Lordſhip. But it falls out to his great mortification, that in the Poſt he is in, though he pretends to be a Judge, yet he is but a Cryer, the Mouth of his Congregation, and ecchos their Sentence of Excommunication, and that of Abſolution alſo. How can he do leſs, ſince he eats their Bread, wears their Livery, and is their Stipendiary. I produc'd him an Example of this kind juſt now. But that we have power to judge and abſolve, is manifeſt in the caſe of Dying Perſons, confeſſing their Sins and deſiring Abſolution.

Vide *Office of Viſitation of the Sick.*

In a word, we are not aſham'd of the name Prieſt, though we are ſenſible the Diſſenters, oft call us ſo out of contempt : and we are aſham'd of their folly in upbraiding us with a Title, which the holy Scripture has given us.

CHAP. II.

Being an Anſwer to Mr. O's 2d Chap.

IN the firſt Chapter of the *Tentamen N.* my deſign was to conſider in their Order, all thoſe Paſſages of Scripture which ſeem any way to concern Ordination, or any other Act of Eccleſiaſtical Government, excepting what belongs to the Church of *Epheſus* in particular ; which is Treated of by it ſelf afterward. Here I take notice of *Matthias* conſtituted an Apoſtle in the place of *Judas*, *Act.* 1. of the Deacons being appointed and ordain'd unto their Office, *Chap.* 6. of *Peter* and *John's* laying on of hands upon ſome of the New Converts of *Samaria*, *Chap.* 8. of *Ananias* impoſing hands upon *Saul*. *Chap.* 9. of *Barnabas* and *Saul's* Separation unto the Miniſtry of the Gentiles. *Chap.* 13. of the Ordinations mention'd. *Chap.* 14. of St. *Paul's* laying hands on twelve at *Eph. Chap.* 19. of *Timothy's* Ordination ſpoken of, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *Epiſ.* 21. 6. and not known when nor in what place given him : of the delivering the Inceſtuous Perſon unto *Satan*. 1 *Cor.* 5. and of the Council of *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. Now 'tis all one to me, and to my deſign in this Chapter, what becomes of the four firſt Inſtances, and of that other in the 19*th* of *Acts*, whether they were Ordinations or not. If not, let *Mr. Prinn* look to it, or *Mr. O.* in his behalf. As they will do me no good, ſo they can do me no harm. Though if they ſhould prove Ordinations, the advantage I made of 'em is of ſome moment in the Queſtion before us, they being perform'd either by Apoſtles, or Prophets,

Prophets, no other inferior and ordinary Church Officer joining with 'em, which was what I level'd at againſt *Mr. Prim.*

But the firſt uncontroverted Ordination unto the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments, is that of *Barnabas* and *Saul, Act.* 13*th.* This Ordination was had by *Prophets and Teachers,* who receiv'd an expreſs and extraordinary Commiſſion from God, to ſeparate theſe two unto the work *whereunto* (ſays the Holy Ghoſt) *I have called them.* Seeing then Prophets, as Superiour, and extraordinary Species of Church Officers, influenc'd by the immediate and expreſs Command of the Holy Ghoſt; preſided over this work of Separating *Barnabas* and *Saul,* it can be no ſufficient warrant nor Precedent unto meer Presbyters, to Ordain by Virtue of their Ordinary Power and Office. Herein lies the force of my Obſervation, which ought to have been fairly anſwered.

But *Mr. O.* inſtead of this falls a cavilling, at my expounding *Def.* p. 68. *Prophets and Teachers,* the ſame Perſons that is, ordinary Miniſters (or Presbyters) endu'd at that time with the Gift of Propheſy, or receiving a Special Commiſſion from Heaven. *Whereas He will needs have 'em diſtinct Perſons and Officers: Prophets and Teachers in* Senſu Diviſo.

Anſ. I will not here deny but *Mr. O's* interpretation *may* be true, yet neither can I ſee any thing hinders but mine *may* be ſo. For *Caiaphas* was but an ordinary (though the ſupreme) Officer in the Church of the Jews, and yet he propheſy'd, and by Conſequence *pro hâc vice* was a Prophet. If a Man would have deſcrib'd him, it had not been improper to have ſaid, he was *a Prophet and the High Prieſt.*

Now, how to compromiſe this ſmall difference between us, I know not. I'll therefore ſuppoſe what *Mr. O.* takes for granted, (though at the ſame time I think the contrary is moſt evident, *Saul* and *Barnabas,* at leaſt being both Prophets and Teachers;) the *Prophets* there ſpoken of, were Perſons different from the *Teachers.* Yet if it be ſo, my Argument is not alter'd, nor ever the worſe: ſtill the *Teachers* were preſided over by the *Prophets,* and ſtill the Ordainers acted by Special and extraordinary Commiſſion from Heaven, which cannot warrant ordinary Presbyters and Teachers, to Ordain by Virtue of their ordinary Power. If *Mr. O.* himſelf, or any Layman, ſhould ordain ſome Perſon by Special Command from God appointed thereunto, no body could with Reaſon call his Ordination into Queſtion. But then this could not rationally be drawn into example, nor juſtify every private Believer in *England,* to ordain at his own Pleaſure.

It is not Material, whether the Revelation was immediately given to the *Teachers,* or to the *Prophets* only, and by them unto the *Teachers:* nevertheleſs I think *Mr. O.* ought not to deny the former. The words run thus ——— *And they* (the Prophets and Teachers) *Miniſtred unto the Lord and faſted, and the Holy Ghoſt ſaid, Separate me* Barnabas *and* Saul, &c. *and when they had faſted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they ſent 'em away.* They who ſent *Barnabas* and *Saul* away, were the ſame that ſeparated them by impoſition of hands, and they who ſeparated *Barnabas* and *Saul,* were the Perſons to whom the Holy Ghoſt ſpake, and they to whom the Holy Ghoſt ſpake, were the Perſons, that Miniſtred unto the Lord and faſted; and they who Miniſtred unto the Lord and faſted, were the *Teachers* as well as the *Prophets.* Therefore the Revelation was communicated immediately to the *Teachers,* therefore the *Teachers* were *Prophets* alſo: therefore

this is no Precedent unto common Presbyters, to ordain by virtue of their ordinary power; by conſequence my Argument holds good.

Concerning the Ordinations ſpoken of *Act.* 14. 23. I noted that *Paul* and *Barnabas* acted not therein, by any Special Revelation, but by their Apoſtolical Power, being not aſſiſted therein by any Presbyters; that therefore theſe cannot be good Preſidents for Presbyterian Ordination.

Def. p. 74. Mr. *O.* Replies that, *this Inſtance makes little for me.*

Anſ. It makes thus much for me, that it makes nothing for the Diſſenters, nor againſt me, which is what I deſign'd by it: though I might ſay it is a plain Inſtance of Ordination, by Church Officers, Superiour to Presbyters.

As for Mr. *O's* reaſon why *Philip* did not lay hands on with *Peter* and *John*, viz. becauſe it was no Ordination, but conferring the extraordinary Gift of the Spirit, which *Philip* could not do, Mr. *O.* forgot to take notice of the whole Argument, but Anſwers it by halves. I urg'd, that *Philip* had the extraordinary and Miraculous Gift of the Spirit, which was uſually conferred by Impoſition of hands, that though he had this Gift, yet he could not give it: that therefore they who have a Gift, yet may not have power to conferr that Gift; and by conſequence, that thoſe Perſons who are ordain'd to the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments, it does not follow that they can Ordain, which was the thing to be prov'd.

There is nothing that I perceive meriting any Reply until we come to that piece of Diſcipline, 1 *Cor.* 5. where we read of the Inceſtuous *Corinthian* Excommunicated (as I contend) by the Authority and Command of St. *Paul.*

Def. p. 79. But Mr. *O.* inſinuates, that the Apoſtle *reproves the* Corinthians *for not excommunicating the Sinner themſelves*, 1 Cor. 5. 2.

Anſ. This verſe proves it not. The expreſſion is in the Paſſive ἵνα ἐξαρθῇ —That the Offender *might be taken away.* By whom? Why not by the Apoſtle? He may as well be thought to chide 'em, for not informing him of the miſdemeanour, to the end, the Offender might be delivered unto *Satan* by St. *Paul* himſelf. The whole Story as we ſhall ſhew Countenances this Interpretation.

Ay, but (ſays the Miniſter) *the Apoſtle enjoins the* Corinthians *to avoid diſorderly walkers*, v. 13.

Anſ. But this is by the Apoſtles expreſs commandment ſtill. Beſides *to put away from among themſelves that wicked Perſon*, is not to deliver him to *Satan*, or to expel him the Church, but *Not to eat with him*, v. 11. that is, not to have any Familiarity with him, in civil Converſation. In this the Apoſtle does indeed declare, v. 12. that the *Corinthians* had power to *Judge*, with whom they might be Familiar, and with whom not; But it does not hence follow they had power to Excommunicate. Now that it was St. *Paul* who judged and decreed, and gave the Sentence of Excommuncation againſt the Offender, will appear plainly, if we read the firſt part of the 3*d* verſe, with the 5*th v.* (for all the reſt is a *Parentheſis*) Thus then let us put 'em cloſe together, *v.* 3. *For I verily, as abſent in Body, but preſent in Spirit, have determined already* (then v. 5.) *to deliver ſuch an one unto Satan.* For παραδοῦναι muſt be governed of κέκρικα, and ſo the Excommunication moſt certainly proceeded from the Apoſtle. It is alſo worthy conſideration, that the *Corinthians* did not receive again into their Communion, this Excommunicated Perſon, until the Apoſtle had abſolved him, and then beſought them to confirm their Love towards him. 2 *C.* 28. 10.

In

In the next place I am accuſed of altering and perverting the Text. An heavy charge, which ought not to be paſſed over lightly. The Accuſation is, that *v.* 4. I have put the Words thus, *Of my Spirit*, whereas the Tranſlators leaving out *of*, render the place thus, *My Spirit*, not *Of my Spirit*.

Anſ. Since the Grammatical conſtruction will bear it, there is no reaſon of accuſing me of perverting the Text. Now καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος may be coupled with τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, συναχθέντων ὑμῶν, being put abſolute and into a Parentheſis. Upon this ſuppoſition, then, thus the Words may be laid—*In the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and my Spirit* (or *of my Spirit*) which is the ſame thing) *when ye are gathered together*, &c. So that *Mr. O.* could not have any juſt pretenſe for his Accuſation, whatever becomes of my Interpretation of the Text. This, perhaps he may call into Queſtion : and my purpoſe now is to vindicate it.

I cannot reconcile my ſelf unto that Opinion, which Couples τὸ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος with συναχθέντων ὑμῶν, thus more plainly in Engliſh——*When ye and my Spirit are gathered together*. *Paul* was now at *Epheſus*, both Body and Spirit. I can form no Idea of his Spirit aſſembling with the *Corinthians*, at ſo great a diſtance. True, he tells 'em, that he is *preſent* (with 'em) *in Spirit*, but Corrects himſelf immediately ὡς παρών, *As though I were preſent*. So that the Senſe is, St. *Paul* was preſent with 'em, in Heart and Affections, ſtudying their welfare, wiſhing them well, and praying that their Souls might be Saved, and their Church Edified, in Peace and Purity. Or, why not preſent among 'em by his Authority? As we ſay, the King is every where preſent in his Dominions, by his Influence and Providence. But that the Spirit of *Paul* ſhould be gathered, or aſſembled with the *Corinthian* Congregation, is a too harſh and improper Expreſſion, at leaſt in my Fancy and Opinion, eſpecially, ſince ſo Commodious and agreeable Senſe may be given of the Words. Nor let any one ſuſpect me to have advanced this Interpretation to ſerve a cauſe which ſtands in no need of it. For if it ſhall ſtill be thought that συναχθέντων ὑμῶν, καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος are to be coupled, then the latter Words muſt import the Apoſtles Authority, (as I formerly expounded it) : And leaſt the Apoſtle ſhould ſeem too aſſuming, in thus inſiſting on his own Authority, with great caution he adds——*With the Power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. As if he had ſaid, *my Authority, but in Conjunction with, and ſubordination to the Power of Chriſt*. For ſo the Apoſtle was wont oftimes carefully to prevent miſtakes, leſt he ſhould be thought to have Uſurpt his Power. Thus he, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. ſpeaking of his Authority, adds, *Which the Lord hath given us*, &c. And *Chap.* 2. 10. (which comes nearer to our purpoſe) when he had granted the Abſolution of the Excommunicated Perſon, *I forgave it* (ſays he) *in the Perſon of Chriſt*.

Upon the whole matter, thus much, at leaſt, may be ſaid of this Inſtance of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, that St. *Paul* directed and commanded it, which is all I need to be concerned for. For then it can be no preſident for a College of Presbyters, much leſs for a particular Miniſter of one ſingle Congregation, to Excommunicate, which was the thing I intended to Evince.

I proceed now to the Story of *Timothy*'s Ordination briefly related, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. of which in the firſt place, I delivered this as my own ſettled Opinion, That *Timothy* underwent two Ordinations, the one for Presbyter, the other for Biſhop (or Supreme Ruler) of the Church of *Epheſus*. One of

C my

my Reaſons for this, was, becauſe *Paul* himſelf ſeemed to me to have been twice Ordained, once *Aƈ*. 9. 15, 16, 17. and again *Chap*. 13. the firſt, unto the Ordinary Miniſtry of the Word, the ſecond, unto the Apoſtle of the

Def. p. 82. Gentiles. Againſt this *Mr. O.* Argues.

1. " That *Paul*, was more than an Ordinary Miniſter of the " Word (*Gal*. 1. 1.) meaning before he received that Impoſition of hands, *Aƈ*. " 13. that is, from the time of his Converſion.

Anſ. He might as well ſay, that *Paul* was an Apoſtle from his Birth or from his Mother's Womb, *Gal*. 1. 15. *For then* (as we there read) *God ſeparated him*. Beſides this Teſtimony of Scripture, *Gal*. 1. 1. proves not what 'tis alledged for; becauſe *Paul* wrote this Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, after he had been Ordained, (*Aƈts* 13.) then confeſſedly on all ſides, an Apoſtle.

2. " He argues from, 2 *Cor*. 12. 2. *Aƈ*. 9. 17. that *Paul* was honoured with " Viſions and Revelations, and received extraordinary Gifts of the Holy " Ghoſt.

Anſ. Neither will this prove *Mr. O's* point: for *Philip* had extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, and was Honoured with Revelations, *Aƈts* 8. *Cornelius* a *Roman* Centurion, not yet a Chriſtian, only a Jewiſh Proſelite, had a Viſion, *Aƈ*. 10. 13. and the Gentiles before they were Baptized, received the Holy Ghoſt, and ſpake with Tongues, *v*. 44. 46. why not *Paul* then, even when he was but a meer Miniſter, or Presbyter?

" He ſtill pleads, that *Paul* was more than an Ordinary Presbyter, at *Ananias*'s " laying on of hands upon him, 1 *Cor*. 15. 8, 9. *where* (ſays *Mr. O.*) Paul *reckons* " *himſelf one of the Apoſtles, from the time of his Miraculous Converſion.*

Anſ. This I deny. *Paul* does not there reckon himſelf an Apoſtle from his Converſion. He tells the *Corinthians* that he *had ſeen Chriſt*, which qualified him for being an Apoſtle and Witneſs of Chriſt's Reſurrection, but conferred not the Gift, or Office. And he tells 'em he was *born out of due time*, and was, as it were, a *Poſthumus* in compariſon with the twelve (who were Apoſtles before him), and therefore *the leaſt of the Apoſtles*, which words do not imply, that he was an actual Apoſtle, ſo ſoon as he was converted, but, that when he wrote that Epiſtle, he was then an Apoſtle, though the leaſt, and the laſt of 'em.

Mr. O. Yet alledges, *Gal*. 1. 15, 16, 17. *Neither went* I (ſays *Paul*) *up to Jeruſalem, to them which were Apoſtles before me*, " which (ſays the Miniſter) im- " plies, he was an Apoſtle himſelf at that time.

Anſ. At what time? The natural ſenſe is, that at the time of St. *Paul*'s writing this Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, he was then an Apoſtle, that's undeniable. But was it not true, and might not *Paul* appoſitely ſay, that the twelve were Apoſtles before he was, meaning before he was called by the Holy Ghoſt, and Solemnly ſeparated thereunto by the Prophets and Teachers, at *Antioch*, *Aƈ*. 13. 1, 2, 3?

Moreover, to confirm my Point, I offer to conſideration, that if *Paul* was an Actual Apoſtle, in *foro Eccleſiæ*, from his Converſion, why then was he ſeparated thereto, by the Prophets and Teachers, *Aƈ*. 13. If it be ask'd what then is the meaning of that Text, *Gal*. 1. 1? And was not *Paul* called to the Apoſtleſhip of the Gentiles by Chriſt, *Aƈ*. 9. 15? *Anſ.* I ſaid enough of this in the *Tent. Nov.* In ſhort, then in *Aƈts* 9. *Paul* is only deſigned for the Apoſtleſhip, not actually admitted to it. In *Chap*. 13. *Paul* is actually, effectually and ſolemnly initiated into the Apoſtleſhip,

poſtleſhip, and there expreſly called thereunto by God. *v. 2. Separate me* Barnabas *and* Saul, *for the work, whereunto I have called them*, that is, to the Apoſtleſhip of the Gentiles. Hereunto *Paul* (I conceive) alludes, *Gal.* 1. 1. and in other places, where he ſpeaks of his being called to the Apoſtleſhip by God.

For the further confirmation, therefore, of my own Opinion, I offer unto conſideration, that there is little recorded of his ſucceſs in Preaching the Goſpel, from the time of his *Converſion*, to that of his *Separation* (which was about Eleven Years) that his old name of *Saul* was all that while continu'd unto him, and he is never once called Apoſtle. That after his ſeparation, *Act.* 13. all his Labours are Remembred exactly, and his wonderful ſucceſs recorded, his name was immediately changed into *Paul Act.* 13. 9. and the Title of Apoſtle given him. *Act.* 14. 4. 14. Yet I am preſt with that Paſſage, *Act.* 22. 18. 21. where our Lord appeared unto him in the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, ſaying—*Make haſte, get thee quickly out of* Jeruſalem, v. 18. *for I will ſend thee far hence unto the Gentiles*: and this was before his Ordination, mentioned, *Act.* 13.

Anſ. But this was long after his Converſion, and therefore ſhews, that he was not the Apoſtle of the Gentiles from the beginning, God having not as yet ſent him. This interview between Jeſus Chriſt and *Paul*, was at his being at *Jeruſalem*, ſpoken of, *Act.* 9. 26. *Gal.* 1. 18. as I conceive, and happened (I do acknowledge) before his Separation, *Act.* 13. But let us mind the Words—— *I will ſend thee*: The Lord did not then actually ſend him, but promiſed that he would hereafter ſend him to the Gentiles. And the performance of this promiſe *Paul* doubtleſs waited for, as the other Apoſtles did, another promiſe of the like Nature, *Act.* 1. 4. 8. As this latter promiſe was afterward made good to the Twelve, on the Day of *Pentecoſt*, ſo was the former unto *Paul*, *Act.* 13.

It remains then very probable, that *Paul* was a Miniſter of the Word, before he was an Apoſtle, that he was twice Ordained, firſt to the ordinary Office of a Presbyter, ſecondly to the Apoſtleſhip of the Gentiles, which is a good reaſon therefore to believe *Timothy* twice Ordained, firſt to the Office of a Presbyter, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. ſecondly, to the Prefecture (or Biſhoprick) of *Epheſus*. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. So *Jerom* himſelf expounds that, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6——*ad Epiſcopatum ſcilicet*. *And ſo was* Barnabas *alſo.*

Before I diſmiſs this, I will for once take notice of a moſt diſingenuous and deceitful Remark of my Adverſaries, when he thus informs his Reader——*The Rector* (ſays he) *allows that* Timothy *was made a Presbyter by Presbyters*, which Mr. *O.* cannot but know, is falſe; *By Presbyters*, (when I ſay ſo) 'tis manifeſt, and I oft enough declared, that I underſtood ſuch Presbyters as Ordained *Timothy*, but had Special, Divine and Extraordinary Commiſſion from God thereunto, or elſe in Conjunction with, and Subordination to ſome extraordinary Prophet preſiding over them: but not by Virtue of their own ſingle ordinary Power: That, therefore this Inſtance cannot be drawn into Conſequence; I obſerve this for once (as I ſaid) to ſhew what an Adverſary I have to do with, and to give the Reader a Taſte of the way of his Controverting. I have pretermitted, and will paſs over ſome hundreds of this kind. *Def.* p. 84.

In the Explication of προφητείας I obſerved, that by *Prophecy* might be underſtood *Prophets*, the Abſtract for the Concrete, as Presbytery is put for Presbyters: that, if *Timothy* was Ordained but once, then muſt he have been Ordained by *Paul* (2 *Tim.* 1. 6.), who alſo was ſpecially determined thereto by Revelati-

en, and ſo acted therein as an *Apoſtle* and *Prophet*, that is, Ordained *Timothy* by Prophecy, the Presbyters joining with him: that if there were more Prophets than one concerned in this Ordination, *Silas* might have been another, who is ſtiled a Prophet, *Act.* 15. 32. he having been *Paul's* Companion before, *Timothy* v. 40. and after alſo *Chap.* 16. 25, 17, 15, 18, 5. Laſtly, that if nothing of this will be allowed, then it muſt be ſaid, that the Presbyters by Special Revelation, and Prophecy appointed thereunto, Ordained *Timothy*. And I give *Mr. O.* his choice of any of theſe Expoſitions: If he accepts the laſt (as moſt likely he will) it is however no precedent or warrant for Ordinary Presbyters, by Virtue of their Ordinary Power and Office, to Impoſe hands and Conferr Orders. *Mr. O.* in reply to this, has not offer'd one Syllable: but he has interpoſed ſome (as he thinks) witty deſcants upon the Rector's words and notions, merely to evade the Argument, and to perplex it; which I account not worth my particular Notice.

But whereas he thus Paraphraſes on my Words, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given by Prophets, with the laying on of the Hands of Prophets*, intimating it to be Nonſenſe, obſerve me once more, and Remember that the Rector propoſed two ways of Interpreting this Paſſage in *Timothy*. *Firſt*, That by *Prophecy* may be meant Prophets in the *Concrete*, diſtinct from the *Presbyters*, ſpoken of in the ſame Period; and then the ſenſe muſt be, *Neglect not the Gift which was given thee by Prophets*, (directed and determined unto that Action, by ſome Extraordinary and Expreſs Command of God) *with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbyters*, as aſſiſtants in the Solemnity. Either this is ſenſe, or I have none, and being admitted, confirms my Point, *That Ordinary meer Presbyters Ordained not* Timothy *by their own ſole Power*. *Secondly*, Or elſe the Paſſage may thus be underſtood, That *Prophecy* is to be taken in the Abſtract, as it lies in the Text, and the Presbyters were the Perſons, unto whom the Prophecy came, appointing them to Ordain *Timothy*, who therefore were Prophets, and not Ordinary Presbyters in that particular Action. On this ſuppoſition the Words muſt run, *Neglect not the Gift, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbyters*, unto whom the Prophecy came. And this ought to paſs with *Mr. O.* for ſenſe, if he is Maſter of any, and ſhews, that meer Ordinary Presbyters, did not Ordain *Timothy*, by Virtue of their Ordinary Power, but by Special Commiſſion from God. But *Mr. O.* confounds theſe two different Interpretations, putting them together (which ought to be conſidered ſeparately) contrary to all Laws of Diſputation, and then pretends to have found out ſome Abſurdity, or Nonſenſe in the Rector's Gloſs. Moreover, the Gloſs is not abſurd, even as *Mr. O.* has laid it. For ſuppoſing that by *Prophecy* is meant *Prophets*, and that the *Presbyters* were thoſe *Prophets*, 'tis proper enough to ſay, *That* Timothy *was ordained by Prophets, with the laying on of the Hands of the Prophets*, the former Clauſe denoting who ordained him; the latter by what Ceremony or Solemnity, it was performed.

Nor is it a degrading *Paul*, when we make him a Prophet, which
Def. p. 85. is an order Inferior to Apoſtle, as *Mr. O.* weakly enough argues. Its
Jo. Ep. 1. 2. not unuſual to give Perſons an Inferior Title. St. *John* and St. *Pe-*
1 *Pet.* 5. 1. *ter* are called Presbyters, *Saul* and *David* Prophets, *Balaam* a Prince,
Deut. 18. was a Prophet, ſo was *Daniel*, and ſo was *Caiaphas* the High-Prieſt,
15. and ſo was *Paul* ſometimes, who had Viſions and Revelations. I ſay
Sometimes. For ſometimes alſo he ſpake and wrote with the Spirit

of

of a Reaſonable Man, only, though at the ſame time with Apoſtolical Authority. For the Power of an Apoſtle was permanent and habitual, his Character indelible, though that of a Prophet was not ſo: See concerning this *Jerom*'s Comment on *Malachy*, and his *Proem* to Comment, on the Epiſtle to *Philemon*. 1 *Cor*. 7. 6. 12. 25.

But *Mr. O.* queſtions whether the Apoſtles were the Heads of the Presbyteries, in the Churches by them planted, becauſe *then the Churches by them planted muſt have had two* or more *Heads*. *Def*. 88. 89.

Anſ. If ever any Man lov'd to Trifle, and Embroil matters with Trivial, and Senſleſs Difficulties, the Miniſter is He. For what if *Barnabas* was inferior to *Paul*, and (as I may ſay) a Subaltern Apoſtle? then the Objection is gone. And what if ſeveral Perſons in equal Power, may make up (not Heads, but) one *Political* Head in a Society? Then the Wonder is over. In *Diocleſian's* Days, there were ſeveral Emperours *Socii Imperii*. There were lately two Czars in *Moſcovy*, and two Princes in *England*. 'Tis indeed Monſtrous, when a *Natural* Body has two or more Heads: But that a *Political* Body or Society, ſhould be governed by two or more Perſons jointly in a Parity, nothing is more Ordinary: *Cæſar* indeed was of another Mind, and his Maxim was, *Imperium non capit duos*: but 'twas his Pride and Ambition, which Prompted him to ſay ſo. For matter of Fact, and his Succeſſors Practice, has abundantly confuted him. But if *Mr. O.* will not allow two or more Governours of a Body Politick, to be called the *Head* of that Society, then are the Presbyterian Churches, and the Independent Congregations, ſo many Bodies without an Head. And I think, a Body without any Head, is altogether as Monſtrous, as a Body with two or more.

Mr. O. adds, "The Presbyters at *Jeruſalem* had many *Apoſtles* to govern them, beſides *Prophets* and *Evangeliſts*, unto whom they were Subject, and not to any one in particular. *Def*. *Ibid*.

Anſ. 1. All the Twelve Apoſtles were Inſtrumental, in planting this Church, which therefore was Subject to all, for a good while, as to one Head. *Secondly*, *James* afterwards was made the Ordinary Reſident Church-Governour, as is very probable. *Thirdly*, The Elders ſpoken of, *Acts* 15. were not thoſe of *Jeruſalem* only (as I conceive) but ſuch alſo as came thither from others parts, *Judea*, *Syria*, &c. and were Members of the Council, and on that ſcore, not ſo much Subject but Aſſiſtants to the Apoſtles. *Fourthly*, The Apoſtles and Elders now Aſſembled, intermedled not in the Government of this Church at this time, but met here (it might have been in any other place, if they had ſo pleaſed) to determin a Queſtion which concerned all Churches, wherein there were any Jewiſh Converts, as may be gathered from, *Acts* 16. 4.

"But *Paul* the Apoſtle (ſays the Miniſter) had Power over all Churches, why is he then made the Governour of *Epheſus* in particular, though he planted it? *Def*. p. 90.

Anſ. Why not? I require a Reaſon. It was his particular care for the Reaſon aſſigned. A Colonel has Power over the whole Regiment, but 'ſpecially over his own Troop. Every Apoſtle had a Tranſcendent Power over every Presbytery (grant it,) yet he was the Ordinary Governour of thoſe Churches, which he had formed. *Camerarius* Comments upon the 2 *Cor*. 10. 15. thus, *Diſignat Paulus*, &c. Paul *means in this place*, *Synop. Crit.*

that

that a Diſtrict, as it were a Plat of ground, was given him, whereon he might build a Church. Still the care of all the Churches lay upon the Apoſtles, as to right and Power, although for the better Government of them, they divided the work, as the neceſſity of Propagating the Goſpel required.

Mr. O. "If the Apoſtle joined the Presbytery with him, in the Ordination "of *Timothy*, it proves that Presbyters have an Inherent Power of Or-"daining.

Anſ. True, it may ſafely be granted, in Conjunction with the Apoſtle, and with Biſhops, but not without them. The Houſe of Commons has an inherent Power to make a Vote of Parliament, but not without the Lords; and both Houſes have an inherent Power to make a Law, but not without the King. 'Tis he that inſpires Life and Breath into it, after the two Houſes have formed the Carcaſs.

Def. p. 91. Laſtly, *Mr. O.* adds——*The Apoſtles are Diſtinguiſhed from the Presbytery*, Act. 15. 23.

Anſ. This is not appoſitely obſerved: for it was a Council not a Presbytery, though the Presbyters of *Jeruſalem* were in it: haply other Presbyters alſo, beſides an Apoſtle (or Apoſtles) though he be the Head (or Governour) of a Presbytery, may be aptly diſtinguiſhed from that Presbytery, whereof he is Head: and yet at the ſame time he is a Member of that Presbytery. Jeſus Chriſt is by St. *Paul* called *the Head of the Body*, (the Church) *Eph.* 22. 23. *c.* 4, 15, 16. *Col.* 1. 18. and ſo is diſtinguiſhed from the Body, though we cannot properly call any thing a Body, except we comprehend the Head alſo: for a body is not a Body without the Head; and the Head is a Member of the Body. And yet St. *Paul* diſtinguiſhes between the Body, that is the Church, and Chriſt the Head of it; when at the ſame time, Chriſt the Head, muſt be believed a Member of his own Body. I expect then *Mr. O.* will in good time rally upon St. *Paul*, and expoſe his Expreſſion, as he has mine.

Moreover though the Apoſtles are diſtinguiſhed from the Elders, yet it follows not that they are diſtinguiſhed from the Council (or Presbytery) when the Members of a Body are diſtinguiſhed from one another, they are not to be underſtood as diſtinguiſhed from the Body, but from one another only. St. *Paul* ſpeaking of the Natural body, 1 *Cor.* 12. tells us, that though the Members of that Body are many, yet 'tis but one Body: and he diſtinguiſhes alſo the Members from one another, as the Hands from the Feet, and both from the Eyes, and all theſe from the Ears, and the Hand from the reſt of the Body, but yet he affirms, they are all of the Body, and together make up the Body. So St. *Luke* reckons the two Principal and Conſtituent Parts of the Council at *Jeruſalem*, and diſtinguiſhes between the Apoſtles and the Elders, between the Head and the lower Members, but not between the Head and the Body, between the Apoſtles and Council: for no one can think but the Apoſtles were a part of the Council, or, if you pleaſe, call it a Presbytery.

I beg the Readers patience, when I ſay, a Body is not a Body without an Head. Our late Presbyteries were ſuch Bodies without viſible Heads. The Claſſical Body moved to the place of meeting, I ſay moved without an Head. A frightful Spectacle! When it had ſat a few moments without an Head, it then made it ſelf an Head, a Preſident or Moderator, *pro tempore*, who was before but an inferior Member, but now mounted up for an hour or two, to be the

Head. But it may be aſk'd who was the Head, when this Head was ſet up? Herein the Body acted without an Head. However the Buſineſs of the day being over, the Artificial Head drops off from the Shoulders, and thence forward is an Hand or a Foot, as before. So every Member of the Body in its turn, becomes the Head; and the Head dwindling again into a ſmall Member. The Body then continues for ſome Days or Weeks without an Head. And would it not ſcare one to ſee a Body once more without an Head? Hereby *Mr. O.* may ſee, 'tis poſſible to ridicule the Presbyteries, if one will take the Liberty to confine Words to their Natural Signification, when they are uſed Metaphorically.

As to my Expoſition of *διὰ* & *μετ*, *διὰ προφητείας* & *μετ' ἐπιθέσεως*, I am not ſenſible *Mr. O.* has advanced any thing conſiderable againſt me. Only, after his uſual and Sophiſtical manner he draws in what is admitted in one place; and oppoſes it to what is ſuppoſed in another, which can with no Juſtice be done. When *ex. gr.* I explain this Paſſage, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. ſuppoſing that by *διὰ προφητείας*, is meant *διὰ προφήτου* or *προφήτων* in the *concrete*. It is a miſerable ſhift to make uſe of, what I here aſſert againſt what afterward I propoſe, when I have admitted the phraſe to be underſtood in the *Abſtract*, and then aſſert *Paul* to be at leaſt one, and the Head or Governour of the Presbytery. I had laid down ſeveral ways of Expounding the Text, and had permited *Mr. O.* to chuſe which he pleaſed, that the Argument might be brought to a certain head. But inſtead hereof he jumbles 'em all altogether, contrary to all Laws of Diſputation. And whereas I laid this clearly before the Reader, *p.* 33. by ſumming up briefly what had been ſaid, he ſhuffles us off with calling it

a Recapitulation of my long perplexed Commentary upon this plain Text. *Def.* p. 95.

Mr. O. has indeed perplex'd it: but it has been judged pretty clear by others. I wiſh *Mr. O.* would have furniſhed us with a better.

Carpere vel noli noſtra, vel ede tua. But the Miniſter is better at pulling down than building up: and indeed it is in a great meaſure the true Character of the whole Party.

In the Concluſion of my Diſcourſe upon the General Hiſtory of the Apoſtolical Churches and their Government, I examined that paſſage of St. *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* 5. but do not find my Adverſary to have ſaid any thing to that purpoſe, or which in the leaſt affects the account I gave of it. Some Cavils are to be met with, but ſuch, as if any one ſuſpects of Moment, let him but compare 'em with what I ſaid in the *Test. Nov.* p. 37. to *p.* 42. and he will eaſily diſcern the ſhifts *Mr. O.* was put to, in framing but a Colourable Reply. Among many other things, I will only in ſhort produce one, and the rather becauſe *Mr. O.* has repeated it, I think above 20 times, and yet 'tis nothing but what I granted more than once. 'Tis this,

" *Timothy* and *Titus* (ſays he) are no where expreſly called " *Biſhops* (in the Scripture) nor Conſtituted Diooeſan *Biſhops.* *Def.* p. 97.

Now I had oft enough granted in *T. N.* and cautioned againſt all miſtake and needleſs cavil, that *Tim.* and *Tit.* are never called *Biſhops*, only contended they were the Supreme Rulers of the Churches of *Epheſus* and *Crete*, that is, in the Language afterwards prevailing in the Church, they were Biſhops. And yet for all this we are at every turn told, they are never in Scripture expreſly called

Biſhops,"

Biſhops, nor conſtituted Dioceſan *Biſhops*, as if I, or any other ever aſſerted it. Nevertheleſs that which I affirm (and which is ſufficient to my purpoſe), is that they had expreſs Commiſſion from St. *Paul* to govern thoſe Chuches, and the particular *Acts* of Supreme Power, are expreſly committed to them, which is enough (I think) to prove 'em the Supreme Rulers of thoſe Churches, and is all I contend for. Beſides *Mr. O.* ſhould Remember, that he himſelf acknowledges 'em Evangeliſts, which where Officers in the Church, Superiour unto Ordinary Presbyters, according to the ſuppoſition agreed upon between him and me; but on the other hand, whether the Presbyter ſpoken of, 1 *Pet.* 5. and *Act.* 20. were ἐπίσκοποι & ἐπισκοποῦντες, ποιμένες & ποιμαίνοντες, that's not to be diſputed, but whether they had the Supreme Power committed to them, is the Queſtion, and is (I hope) reſolved in the Negative, to Satisfaction in the formentioned *Pages* of *I. N. viz.* that it does not appear ſo from thoſe Expreſſions——*Feed the Flock of Chriſt, taking the overſight thereof: Take heed unto the Flock over which the Holy Ghoſt hat made you Overſeers, to feed the Church of God.* For it can not be denied but that theſe Exhortations might be properly given to the Rectors and Vicars of the Church of *England*, though ſubject to a Dioceſan Biſhop. Yea, might be given to *every* ordained Presbyter, though but a Curate.

See Office of Conſecrating Presbyters in the Exhortation.

APPENDIX.

Def. p. 48. MR. *O.* excepts many things againſt my Inſtance of the Jews Eccleſiaſtical Government by an High-Prieſt, inferiour Prieſts and Levites: concerning whom I noted, *That the Fathers, and particularly* Clem. Roman. *ſeems to make this a Preſident for the Government of Chriſtian Chuches, &c.* To the Authority of *Clemens*, I added in the Margin *Jerom's* Epiſtle to *Evag.* That which deſerves to be conſider'd is, that he obſerves the Jewiſh High-Prieſt to have been a Type of Jeſus Chriſt, the High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion, and ſays he, *We follow the Jewiſh Typical precedent*, that is, we acknowledge Jeſus Chriſt to be our High-Prieſt.

Anſ. For all this, the Jewiſh Oeconomy was a Type of the Chriſtian, at leaſt the Fathers, though they make not the Jewiſh High-Prieſt a Type of the Chriſtian Biſhop. Yet they make him a Precedent, or Pattern of him: and *Clemens* does ſo in particular, as alſo many others, as I ſhall ſhew in its proper place, *viz.* my Anſwer to his *Plea.* But why [illegible] *Mr. O.* after ſo much pains taken in Vindicating *Clemens* from what is imputed to him, endeavoured to take off the force of my other Teſtimony [illegible] *Jerom?* There was ſomething in the wind, that he who undertakes to reply ſo fully to the Authority of *Clemens*, leaves poor *Jerom* in the lurch, and [illegible] one Syllable to plead in his behalf. But the reaſon of this is plain, 'twas too hard a Knot for the Miniſter at *Oſweſtry* to Untye, or

ſo

ſo much as to cut. *Blundel* promiſed to account for it, but was not as good as his Word. *Walo* put us in hopes of it from *Salmaſius:* But he deceived the World of their expectation: and honeſt *Ludovicus Capella*, was afraid to take the leaſt notice of it. I know nothing that can excuſe Mr. *O.* and the other Gentlemen For a Parting-blow upon this Argument, Mr. *O.* entertains us with a piece of Drollery. The Rector (ſays he) *calls the Teachers Ordinary Miniſters, and at the ſame time, ſaith they, were Prophets, that is extraordinary Miniſters.* "One would "think if they were Ordinary Miniſters, they were not extraordinary, If Ex- "traordinary, not Ordinary.

Now the Rector undertakes to reconcile *this Contradiction*, and to expoſe Mr. *O.* as a meer Trifler. The ſame Man may be an Ordinary and an Extraordinary Perſon, on ſeveral Accounts, not *Secundum idem.* I'll give him one ſingle Inſtance, and ſo diſmiſs this Point. Mr. *O.* is (as I reckon) but an Ordinary Miniſter, and yet I account him an Extraordinary Wrangler.

I had ſaid in *T. N.* according to my preſent apprehenſions, that *James was not the Apoſtle*, but Mr. *O.* "will needs have him *the* "*Apoſtle*, that is, one of the Twelve, for that was my meaning. *Def.* p. 77.

Anſ, This I am ſenſible, has of old, and is ſtill, a Controverſy among the Learned: and Biſhop *Pearſon*, whom the Miniſter gets on his ſide, as oft as he can, is not very Poſitive in it, though he inclines that Way. However, I'll comply with Mr. *O.* for once, and let *James* paſs for one of the Twelve Apoſtles: but then I muſt acquaint him, that one of the Twelve Apoſtles, was the fixt and conſtant Prefect or Ruler, that is, Biſhop of the Church of *Jeruſalem.* We read of him being at *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 12. 17. *Gal.* 1. 19. *Act.* 15. 13. *Gal.* 2. 9, 12. *Act.* 21. 18. All which time to his Death, takes up near Thirty Years, as is computed. It ſeems then that he was fixt and reſident at *Jeruſalem.* *Salmaſius* thinks that he never was abſent from *Jeruſalem*, nor mov'd a foot once from thence to his Dying Day. Now that he was Prefect or Biſhop there, is proved from *Clem. Alexandrinus*, from the Council of *Conſtantinople*, from *Hegeſippus*, and from *Jerom*, beſides a Cloud of Witneſſes more (and among them *Calvin*) that might be adduced in confirmation of this. Whoever pleaſes to be ſo curious, may be directed to 'em in the fourth Chapter of the Learned Mr. *Burſcough's Treatiſe of Church-Government*, from whom I have borrowed all this, and ſeveral other things in theſe Papers.

Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 2. c. 1. *Theodoret. Hiſt.* l. 5. c. 9. *E. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 23. L. 4. c. 22. *Jer. Cat. Ser.*

APPENDIX.

IN this Chapter Mr. *O.* has mov'd two Controverſies in Philology his Maſter-Piece, on which he ſeems to value himſelf; the firſt whereof is, that I call the Government of the Church by the Apoſtles an *Oligarchy*, which he ſays is a miſtake. I had prepared a pretty *Def.* p. 54.

large and exact Account of this Word, but have thought good to contract it: and 'tis in ſhort this, that tho' *Plato* * diſparages *Oligarchy* in compariſon with *Monarchy*, and *Ariſtotle* † calls it not *Oligarchy* (for with him thats the Corruption of the Government) but *Ariſtocracy*: yet that the word Originally ſignifies a lawful and honeſt kind of Government, and ſets forth the true and diſtinct Nature of it, as is manifeſt from its Etymology, which *Ariſtocracy* doth not; for this word, according to the Philoſopher, denotes any of the Three ſorts of Government well managed: that *Magabyzus* in *Herodotus* * commends this form of Government, by the very name of *Oligarchy*: that *Plutarch* † ſpeaks of it, under the ſame name, deſcribing it alſo by two Words, Ἀριστοκρατίαν Ὀλιγαρχίαν, and calling its Corruption Δυναστείαν, not *Oligarchy*: that *Heſychius* * reckons up Three kinds of Government, one of which is *Oligarchy*: and Laſtly, that *Ariſtotle* himſelf confeſſes † *when a few govern well, and for the Common good, it is a right and juſt Government*, plainly implying there was no harm in the Word *Oligarchy*, or in the Government, *though in his time and Country cuſtom had diſparaged it*.

* *De Repub. Dial.* 8.
† *Polit.* l. 3. c. 7, 8.
* *Thalia or* l. 3. c. 80.
† In *libel. de Mon. Olig.* & *Dem.*
* *Lexic. voce* ὀλιγαρχούμενοι
† *Ariſt. ubi ſupra.*

The next thing he quarrels about is my writing *Sanedrin*, and that I *ſeem to make it an* Hebrew *word*.

Anſ. The Rector neither makes nor ſeems to make *Sanedrin* an *Hebrew* word: but if Mr. *O.* had any good Nature, or Obſervation in him, he would rather have concluded that the Rector *ſeems* to derive the Word from συνέδριον, as himſelf alſo believes. For my writing *Sanedrin* without the Aſpirate *h* in the middle, might reaſonably have been judged, done, in Conformity to the Greek Language, which frequently caſts away the Aſpirat *h* in the middle of Compound words, the Conjugates at leaſt of many derived from ἕδρα, this eſpecially *Synedrium*. Wherefore ſince Mr *O.* will needs have *Sanhedrin* borrowed from the Greeks, 'tis more conformable to the Original συνέδριον, or to writ it *Sanedrin*, not *Sanhedrin* with the Aſpirat. And to ſpeak the very Truth in writing that Word, my thoughts were ever upon the Greek Noun συνέδριον, without Examining into the Orthography.

But when all is ſaid concerning this Word *Sanhedrin*, I muſt acknowledge, I have ſome ſcruple, and ſuſpicion about it. 'Tis very odd in my Thoughts, that the Name of this great Council, which began with *Moſes*, ſhould deſcend from the Greek Tongue, a long while unknown to the Jews: And that it ſhould have no other Title in the Hebrew Language, that I ever heard of. But enough, or too much, of this Trivial matter.

CHAP. III.

Being an Anſwer to Mr. O'*s* 3d Chap.

MR *O.* in this Chapter, undertakes, firſt to eſtabliſh his own *Hypotheſis*, *ſcil.* that *Paul* at his taking final leave of the *Epheſian* Elders (*Act.* 20.) appointed them the *ſole Governours* of that Church, in a Parity, and that this Conſtitution was, and was intended to be unchangeable. I will briefly run through his Arguments, and as I go along, make my Anſwer to every one of 'em ſingly. *Def.* p. 99. 100, 101, 102, 103.

Mr. *O.* " The Apoſtle did not appoint one Presbyter Su- " preme, to preſide over the reſt: For *Timothy* (and *Titus*) " were not Ordinary Preſbyters, but extraordinary Officers, that is, Evange- " liſts: There is no hint in the Epiſtles to *Tim.* and *Tit.* that they were Ordained " to be the Apoſtles Succeſſors, in *Epheſus*, and *Crete.* P. 99, 100.

Anſ. I ſhall conſider in the following Fifth Chapter, this pretence of their being extraordinary Officers, and Evangeliſts, whereby Mr. *O.* would evade our Argument, for *Timothy*'s being made the Preſect or Ruler, of *Epheſus*, in the Apoſtles ſtead, mean while, granting there is no hint in the Epiſtle to *Tim.* that he was Ordained to be the Apoſtle's Succeſſor in *Epheſus* (though the ſecond Epiſtle 1. 6. is a ſhrewd Intimation of it, according to *Jerom*) yet it follows not hence, that he was not the Apoſtle's Succeſſor. The Reverend Dr. *Stratford* was not Ordained Preſbyter, with particular deſign to be afterward Biſhop of *Cheſter*, and yet for all that, he is Biſhop of this See.

Mr. *O.* " The Apoſtle did, and it was the proper Seaſon, and his Duty, at " his taking final leave, to ſettle the Government of that Church: But he then " committed it to the Preſbytery, in a Parity, and not to any ſingle Perſon, *Act.* " 20. 28.

Anſ. 1. For any thing to be found in that, *Act.* 20. 28. St. *Paul* might have before this time, appointed a ſingle Perſon, over the *Epheſian* Elders, and ſo have left it. Theſe words——*Take heed therefore unto your ſelves, and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt has made you Overſeers, to feed the Church of God*, might, and may properly enough at this day, be ſpoken unto Preſbyters, ſubject to a Preſident (or Biſhop) ſet over them. But

2. If the Supreme Power was here committed to the Elders, however, its not proved, nor can be, that it was in a Parity: the words might have been ſpoken to 'em, *diviſim*, ſeverally, which diveſts one part of the Diſſenters, of their Preſbyteries.

3. However it was, ſuppoſe the Government lodged in the Preſbytery, St. *Paul* might afterwards, by Divine Authority, intruſt it with a ſingle Perſon. As to the matter of fact, whether he did ſo, is the preſent controverſy; the Iſſue whereof will depend on what follows.

Mr. *O.* " We may with better reaſon affirm, that *Timothy*'s " Power at *Epheſus* was temporary, than that of the Elders. *Def.* p. 102.

Anſ. Not ſo. If *Timothy's* Supreme Power followed that of the Elders, (as ſhall be proved) and if it cannot be proved, that the Form of Government committed to *Timothy* was ever changed, afterwards by any ſubſequent Act of the Apoſtles, the Objection vaniſhes.

Mr. *O.* " *Paul* gives not the leaſt hint, *Act.* 20. of any Ruler ſet, or to be ſet " over them: That he muſt needs know what Government God would have ſet- " led in the Church, &c.

Anſ. What hint is there to be obſerved, in the 1ſt Epiſtle to *Tim.* concerning Preſbyterian Parity? Or indeed of the Preſbyters having the leaſt ſhare in the Church Government? It was as neceſſary he ſhould mention the Preſbytery in his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* (ſuppoſed by Mr. *O.* written before the farewel Sermon) as to make mention of their Prelatical Biſhop, in his Farewel Sermon. Nor did the Apoſtle know beforehand, all the mind and Intentions of God concerning his Church. He knew not ſo much as what would befal himſelf, ſave, what other Prophets told him (*v.* 23.) and yet ſtill he was left in the dark as to many things (*v.* 22.). I ſee no reaſon for believing, *Paul* muſt needs know at that time, God's Intention of altering the Church Government afterwards: If ſo, 'tis not to be wondred, he did not acquaint the Preſbyters with it. Beſides, there's good reaſon to think, that *Paul*, though he knew it, would not acquaint 'em with it, at that time. Happy he ſaw they would not then brook, nor endure to hear of the alteration, and of being ſubject to any other ſingle Perſon, except the Apoſtle himſelf; eſpecially when no Occaſion was, as yet given for it. But in proceſs of time, after ſome of *themſelves were riſen*, and had ſpoke *perverſe things*, and turning Schiſmaticks, *had drawn away Diſciples after them*, v. 30. then was the time for changing the Government, and charging *Timothy* to ſilence thoſe that taught falſe Doctrine, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. and then it was, that at leaſt the Humble, and Peaceable, and Obedient, and Holy Preſbyters, would readily ſubmit to the Change.

Def. p. 103. Mr. *O.* " Asks, whether there were no Prophecy of *Timothy's* " being the future (Biſhop) Ruler of *Epheſus*: If there was, " why did *Paul* ſuppreſs it, in *Act.* 20.

Anſ. I have given a reaſon of this already: But further note, that there was ſuch a Prophecy, as I believe, 1 *Tim.* 1. 18. though it might not have been given, till after *Paul's* farewel Sermon. I add, it is very probable alſo, that he was Ordained unto it, 2 *Epiſt.* 1. 6. So St. *Jerom* thought, as I have already obſerv'd.

Mr. *O.* to overthrow the common reaſon given of the change of Church Government, aſſerts, " That the eſtabliſhment of the Preſbytery at *Epheſus*, was " for *a remedy againſt Schiſm*, therefore the Elders were admoniſhed, to Overſee " the Flock, *v.* 28.

Anſ. The Miniſter here, is not at all fair in his reaſoning; for the Remedy, which the Apoſtles preſcribes againſt the *Wolves*, or *Interlopers*, that would thruſt themſelves in among 'em, and againſt the *Vipers*, which would ariſe, out of their own Bowels, was, *to take heed to themſelves, and to the Flock, to feed the Church of God*, the other words, *over which the Holy Ghoſt has made you Overſeers*, being only a reminding them, by the way, of their Power and Duty. All Government, of what kind ſoever it be, 'tis confeſt, is in general a Remedy againſt Schiſm: But theſe Elders, are not ſaid, to have been Ordained Overſeers

by

by the Apoſtle, as if that particular Government of Preſbyterian Parity, was eſpecially intended for a Remedy againſt future Schiſm. The proper and parcular Remedy here preſcribed, by St. *Paul*, is, *To take heed*, &c. and as it follows *v.* 31. *To watch*, &c. without which 'twas impoſſible to provide Effectually againſt a ſurprize from their Enemies, the *Wolves*, and the *Vipers*, there ſpoken of. Being *Overſeers*, or Governours of the Church, would not do the Work, (whether they acted in a Parity or in Subordination to ſome ſingle Perſon, was the ſame thing as to the Apoſtles Argument here, and whether it were the one or the other ſtill) it was their *taking heed and watching*, muſt ſecure 'em againſt Schiſms and againſt Hereſies. But if afterward this Preſbyterian Parity, was by experience found inconvenient, rather a Nurſery, and Occaſion of Schiſm, and therefore for that very reaſon, altered into Prelatical form of Government, for the ſecurity of the Church in Peace and Order, as *Jerom* owns, it is moſt proper, to ſay, that Prelacy was introduced into the Church, as a deſigned Remedy againſt Schiſm, and not Preſbyterian Parity, which was indeed the Occaſion of it, at leaſt, was not ſufficient to prevent it.

" Mr. *O.* further argues, that God did not, could not change " the firſt inſtituted Church Government, becauſe, he foreſees " all events, and knows how to prevent Schiſms, by apt and effectual Remedies, " and with him is no *variableneſs nor ſhadow of turning*. *Def.* p. 103.

Anſ. Such general Harangues (though grounded on true Principles, if rightly underſtood, and explained) prove nothing. For on the other ſide, we know that God oftimes Repents, and takes new meaſures for the accompliſhing his own great and good deſigns. God imployed *Noah*, a Preacher of Righteouſneſs, to perſwade the then wicked World to Repentance and Reformation; when this ſucceeded not, it repented him that he had made Man, and ſo he drowned all the World, except eight Perſons. God, who himſelf in a Peculiar manner, governed *Iſrael*, appointing what Prophets and Rulers ſhould ſucceed at a vacancy (the Government of *Iſrael*, is hence called a *Theocracy*) yielded to the importunity of the People, and gave them a King, *Saul* to govern them, after the manner of the Nations. But preſently after, it repented God that he had ſet up *Saul* to be King, becauſe he turned back from following God. 1 *Sam* 15. 11. Where then is the abſurdity in ſaying, God upon the Occaſion of Schiſms, directed the Apoſtles to alter the Government among the Chriſtians? Or rather (as Biſhop *Pearſon* * ſpeaks) to perfect and compleat it. For the Apoſtles, ſo long as it ſeemed good unto 'em, retained in their own hands the Government of all the Churches by them founded, as appears from, *Act.* 14. 21, 22, 23. and *Chap.* 15. 36. but when the time of their departure drew on, or when buſineſs encreaſing on their hands, by reaſon of their many converſions, they were forced, to be abſent, or diſtant from thoſe Churches a long time, they ſubſtituted in their Rooms, Succeſſors and ſingle Perſons to preſide over the Churches: Which indeed in exact ſpeaking was not a Change, but a continuance rather of the former Government, all the difference being, that whereas the Apoſtles were Governours of many Churches, theſe their Succeſſors were Rules but of one haply, of which difference I ſpeak afterwards.

* *De ſerie & Succeſ.* p. 73.

Mr.

Def. p. 104. Mr. *O.* after he had endeavoured to confirm his own Opinion, by ſuch weak Arguments, as we have here mentioned, proceeds in the next place to attack mine. Many things are here repeated, which have been anſwered already, and many things offered, which depend on the proof of the main Point, and which to make a particular reply unto, here, were ſuperfluous.

Def. p. 106. Mr. *O.* "The 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. does not ſay, that *Paul* conſtituted "*Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, that is Ruler.

Anſ. Let the Text with the other Paſſages of this Epiſtle, relating unto the Powers committed unto *Timothy* ſpeak for it ſelf. I put 'em together in *I. N.* and Mr. *O.* has no other way to evade the force of the Evidence, but pleading that *Timothy*, was an Evangeliſt, and extraordinary Officer, as before is noted.

Mr. *O* "St. *John* reſided long at *Epheſus*, after *Paul*'s departure thence, he "returned thither after his Releaſe from his Baniſhment at *Patmos*, and lived "there, and among the other *Aſian* Churches until *Trajan*'s days: By conſe-"quence St. *John* was the Supreme Ruler of *Epheſus*, and not *Timothy*.

Anſ. Let us ſee what the Authors, he quotes, ſay in this matter, *Euſeb. l.* 3. *c.* 18. writes. *That in the Perſecution rais'd by* Domitian, John *was baniſhed into the Iſland* Patmos. And out of *Irenæus*, that *he received his Revelation at the latter end of* Domitian's *Reign*. No more than this is to be found in that Chapter, of *Euſeb.* Cited by the Miniſter: and yet Mr. *O.* affirms——— Euſeb. *here writes that* John *returned to* Epheſus, *after he was releaſed*, &c. There is here not a Syllable of *returning*, nor of *Epheſus*, nor of *Releaſed*, nor of *living at Epheſus*, or *among the other* Aſian *Churches until* Trajan's *day*. This notwithſtanding, I do acknowledge that *Euſeb.* in other places aſſerts theſe things. But this ſignifies nothing. *Euſeb.* ſays not that *John* in particular governed *Epheſus*, but the *Aſian Churches* (after the manner it may ſeem of a Metropolitan.) To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks *Jerom*, *C. S. E. Sub Nerva Principe redit Epheſum ibiq; uſque ad Trajanum perſeverans* totas Aſiæ *fundavit rexitq; Eccleſias*. They affirm not that *John* governed theſe *Aſian* Churches, Immediately after St. *Paul*'s departure into *Macedonia*, but in the days of *Trajan*, and after his releaſe out of *Patmos*. Nor do they tell us, who governed *Epheſus*, and the other *Aſian* Churches, from the time of *Paul*'s going into *Macedonia*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. unto the Reign of *Nerva*, or *Trajan*: And therefore *Timothy* might in that Interval of time (notwithſtanding any thing here produced to the Contrary) have been the Ruler (or Biſhop) of *Epheſus*. I do further grant that *Irenæus*, *l.* 3. c. 3. writes that *John remained* among the *Aſian* Chriſtians, or Churches until *Trajan*: but he ſays not that the Apoſtle remained there, from the time of *Paul*'s laſt departing from *Epheſus* into *Macedonia*, when he conſtituted *Timothy* Ruler (or Biſhop) there. One thing muſt not be omitted, that whereas *Euſebius*, and *Irenæus* confeſs (what is indeed manifeſt in Scripture) that *Paul* founded theſe *Aſian* Churches, yet *Jerom* makes *John* the Founder and Ruler of them. (*Totas Aſiæ fundavit & rexit Eccleſias*) which how to reconcile may deſerve a few words. That *Paul* founded the *Aſians* Churches, cannot be deny'd, and ſettled their Government, ought not to be Queſtioned: That theſe *Aſian* Churches were to decay, by the time of *John*'s

St. Edit. Par.

Euſ. H. E. l. 3. c. l. 23. l. 5. c. 24.

John's Baniſhment into *Patmos*, is manifeſt from the Epiſtles unto the Seven Churches in the *Revelations*. That *John* after his Releaſe, returning into *Aſia* new form'd, regulated and reformed thoſe Churches, is moſt probable, and therefore is ſaid by *Jerom*, to have founded and governed them. Perhaps he removed ſome of the Angels or Biſhops of thoſe Churches, who had miſbehaved themſelves, in their Offices, whether for a while he perſonally govern'd 'em all himſelf, without continuing or placing over them Biſhops: or whether as a Metropolitan having a ſubordinate Biſhop in every Church under him, cannot with certainty be determined, but 'tis out of Queſtion, that he appointed Biſhops in them, before he dyed, as appears from *Ignatius* Epiſtles, and from thoſe remarkable words, in *Tertullian*, * *Ordo Epiſcoporum ad Originem recenſus in Joannem ſtabit Authorem.*

* *De Praſcrip. adv. Hær. c.* 32.

Mr. *O.* that he may ſhake off the Argument, for Biſhops drawn from the Angels in the *Revelations* Argues. *Def.* p. 108.

1. " That Angels Miniſter *to* the Heirs of Salvation, *Heb.* 1. 14. which imports a *Miniſtery* not Superiority.

Anſ. He abuſes the Text: 'tis Miniſtring *for* not *to* the Heirs of Salvation. They Miniſter *to* God *for* us. So the King is the Miniſter of (or to God) *Rom.* 13. 4. for us: Nevertheleſs he is our Superior, even as the Angels are. Briefly by this Argument neither Jeſus Chriſt, nor the Apoſtles, nor Biſhops, nor Preſbyters, nor Diſſenting Miniſters, have any Authority: for all theſe Miniſter for our Salvation, or pretend it.

2. " That Angel *ſingular* is often taken Collectively for Angels *plural*, as are Stars alſo.

Anſ. Mr. *O.* has not produced one example hereof. If any one is at leiſure, to examine the Text cited by him, he'll find this true: For of *Mal.* 2. 7. I treat by and by.

3. " That the Epiſtles were directed to all the believers of the *Aſiatick* " Churches (ſo I underſtand him) and not to the Angels only.

Anſ. Not ſo: But to the Angles only for the uſe of the Believers.

4. " That 'tis uncertain whether there is an Hierarchy among the Angels, " that the *Pſeudo-Dionyſius* makes them the loweſt Order: that therefore they " cannot repreſent the higheſt Order in the Church.

Anſ. 'Tis meer jangling to alledge the Opinion, of an Author confeſſedly ſpurious. But 'tis manifeſt that there is an Angelical Hierarchy from * Scripture, and that Angels are the Superior Order may be gathered from, *Rom.* 3. 38. where they reckoned in the firſt place before Principalities and Powers. Laſtly, the Superlative Excellency of Angels, ſuppoſing them the loweſt Order makes them a fit Repreſentation of the Higheſt degree among Men. We may ſay of the meaneſt Angel, *He that is leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven, is greater than* the mightyeſt Potentate of the Earth. Even Jeſus Chriſt himſelf is called an *Angel*, *Mal.* 3. 1.

* *Dan.* 10. 13. *ch.* 12. 1. 1 *Theſ.* 4. 16. *Judge.* 9. *Col.* 1. 16.

5. " That the Holy Ghoſt in the Epiſtles alludes to the Miniſter, of the Syna" gogue, in Conformity to the Language of the Old Teſtament, *Job.* 33. 23. " *Hag.* 1. 13. *Mal.* 2. 1, 7. *ch.* 3. 1.

Anſ.

Anſ. In theſe Texts there is no mention of Synagogues, nor any where elſe in the Old Teſtament. Nor do we meet with *Angels* of the Synagogue, but *Ruler* in the New: nor any where elſe but in the late Rabbins. *Job*'s *Meſſenger* was either a real Angel, or extraordinary Prophet, *Interpreter* and *one of a Thouſand*, v. 23. *Hagga* was a Prophet, ſo was the Baptiſt, not *Miniſters* of Synagogues. When Mr. *O.* appeals unto *Malachy*, he is gone from the Synagogue, to the Temple, and ſo quitted his Argument. Nor doth *Prieſts*, *Mal.* 2. 1. ſignify all, even the Secondary Prieſts in the Temple, but the High Prieſts only in Succeſſion, who are therefore, *v.* 7. expreſt in the ſingular and indefinitely, or if Mr. *O.* will have it ſo, *Prieſts* here ſignfies *Collectively*, all High Prieſts. For it muſt be confeſt, when the *Subject* of a Propoſition is put indefinitely, in the ſingular number, and the *Predicate* belongs to the whole *Species*, then the *Subject* may be taken Collectively, and is equivalent to an *Univerſal* Propoſition, as when we ſay, *Man is a rational Creature*, we mean *all Men* are ſo. But it will be ſaid that the *Predicate*, viz. *his Lips ſhould keep knowledge*, &c. appertains to the whole *Species* of Prieſts, even the *Secondary*. I reply,

1. Suppoſing this, yet ſtill there was an High Prieſt in the Temple: And therefore agreeably hereunto, though all the Elders were called Angels (admitting this) yet there was an Arch-Angel in every Church, unto whom the Epiſtles were directed, who was, *The Angel κατ' ἐξοχὴν*. For a *Angel* in the Epiſtles, is not deſcribed by a *Specifical*, but an *Individual* Character, *ex. gr. the Angel of the Church of Epheſus.* If it be ſaid this is a *Specifical* Character, becauſe all the Elders were Angels of that Church, I return that cannot be. For no body ever directed a Letter, thus indefinitely to all, and to every one, or any one of the ſame Denomination. The Title may haply belong to many Perſons, for different Reaſons, and yet the Letter is intended for ſome one more Eminently called ſo. As if a Letter were directed, *To the Speaker of the Houſe of Commons*, though every Member is Speaker, if he pleaſes, and though of the Topping and forward Commoners, we uſually ſay, *They are Speakers*, becauſe they often Speak to matters in Debate, yet every Foot-Boy will apprehend the Letter is ſent, to a particular determinate Perſon commonly called, *The Speaker*. Wherefore if all the Elders of *Epheſus* were in ſome ſenſe Angels, yet *The Angel* muſt mean ſome ſingle Perſon, known in Special manner ſtiled *Angel*, who could be no other than the Prelatical Ruler of that Church.

A great deal is argued in defenſe of the Hebrew Reading of *Deut.* 32. 8. againſt that of the Seventy. But beſides what has been elſewhere offered in the Vindication of the latter, I here add, That *Clemens Romanus* *, that *Origen* *, and *Jerom**, himſelf the fierce Stickler for the Hebrew, reads the place according to the Seventy. It may then with Reaſon be ſuſpected, that the proud conceited Jews, corrupted this Scripture, to magnify themſelves and their Nation, as if God in dividing the Nations, had his Eye 'ſpecially on the Sons of *Iſrael*, modelling the World according to the number of them, that went down with *Jacob* into *Ægypt*, as the Rabbins imagine.

* * * *Ep. ad Corinth. cont. Celſum.* l. 5. p. 25[illegible]. *Edit. Cant. Comment. in Dan.* c. 7.2.

As

As for the preciſe number of Provinces, and their Guardian Angels, though the Rabbins, and the Hebrew Reading of *Deut.* 32. 8. ſeem to determine them by the number of *Jacob's* Children, who went with him into *Ægypt*, yet neither the Seventy, nor I have adventured ſo punctually to define it, but have left that point uncertain and indefinite. It is not known into how many Provinces God caſt the World at firſt, nor can we tell into how many more he might afterwards multiply, or into how few reduce it: For even the *Romans* were wont ſometimes to increaſe, and ſometimes to diminiſh their Provinces. As therefore God might (for any thing we know) in the beginning, have divided the Nations into Seventy times ſeven Provinces, and conſtituted ſo many Guardian Angels over them, and afterward altered the number of both, by adding or diminiſhing, as he ſaw good: So might he have appointed, and varied the Number of Biſhops, as the Condition of the Church requir'd, into ſometimes more, and ſometimes leſs.

I will conclude the whole Argument, with two or three Obſervations, which will confirm what is before pleaded; That there is an Hierarchy among the Celeſtial Spirits, and Angels (as I ſaid according to the current Opinion in former times) preſiding as Guardians over Kingdoms and Provinces, is Witneſſed by * *Jerom*, who thus delivers himſelf, *Angeli, qui Regnis & Nationibus præſidebant.* That *Angels* in the Revelations is an Alluſion to theſe Guardian Angels, is countenanc'd by that noted Paſſage in *Clemens Alexandrinus* † προκοπαὶ, &c. *The Progreſſions of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, are (I think) imitations of the Angelical Glory, and of that Ordination:* As alſo by that other of *Origen* * *Per ſingulas Eccleſias*, &c. *There are two Biſhops in every Church, one viſible* (the Man Biſhop) *the other inviſible* (the Angel Biſhop.) *I think there may be found both an Angel and a Man, good Biſhops of the Church, and as it were Partners in the Work.* Laſtly, *Optatus Milevitanus* † Stiles Biſhops, Angels, and plainly alludes unto the Apocalyptical Angels. Nor have I met with that Conceit about the Angel of the Synagogue (the Charan or Biſhop) in the Primitive Fathers, who make no uſe of that Notion to explain the Order of Biſhops: For indeed it is the Invention of the later Rabbins. But ſometimes (as I have juſt proved) they allude unto the Angels, and frequently unto the High Prieſts in the Temple.

* *Comment. in Zach.* 1. 8. *Dan.* 7. 2.

† *Strom.* l. 6.

* *Homil. in cap.* 3. *S. Lucæ.*

† *Cont. Parmen.* l. 2. p. 44, 45. *Ed. Mer. Caſaub.*

Mr. *O.* whereas I argu'd, that the Synagogue-Rulers were ſubject to the Jewiſh High Prieſts, *Ob* (ſays he) *ſo are Presbyters to Jeſus Chriſt our High Prieſt.*

Anſ. But we are inquiring about ſubjection unto viſible Rulers, and if Mr. *O.* will needs have the Synagogue a Pattern of the Chriſtian Congregations, then the Presbyters muſt be ſubject unto ſome viſible Superiour, (as were the Rulers of the Synagogues) which he is obliged to Name. Till then my Obſervation is of Moment, but his Reply meerly Deluſory, and Evaſive.

Mr. *O.* "Let the Biſhops produce as clear a Charter for their Order, as the "High-Prieſts did for theirs, and we'll ſubmit.

Anſ. Firſt, It is ſufficient, I ſuppoſe, that the Biſhops Charter is a clear one, as to the Power they Claim and exerciſe, tho' not as to the Title of Biſhop. It makes no great matter what becomes of that. *Secondly,* Let Mr. *O.* bring as

clear a Proof of Preſbyterian Parity, or Independency, or of Preſbyters exerciſing the Supreme Acts of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, as are to be produced from the Epiſtles to *Tim.* and *Tit.* in behalf of Prelacy, that is, for a ſingle Perſons preſiding over Churches and governing them, and there's an end of the preſent Controverſy. *Thirdly*, I aſk Mr. *O.* between him and me, whether he does not ſubmit to ſome Religious uſages, for which there is not ſo clear a Charter in the New Teſtament, as there is in the Old, for ſome of the Jewiſh Rites. Whether he has as clear and expreſs Commandments for Infant Baptiſm, for the Obſervation and Divine Inſtitution of the Lord's-Day, for days of Publick and general Faſts or Humiliation, for Singing *David's Pſalms*, in *Metre*, as the Jews had for Circumciſion, for *Saturday-Sabbath*, for their Faſting-Days, and for their Singing the Book of *Pſalms*, in their way? It is not then for want of a clear Charter (as I fear) that he refuſes to ſubmit to Biſhops, but for want of a clear Underſtanding, and a peaceable and humble mind. He that can ſit down with reaſonable Deductions, and be prevailed with, to make no ſcruple of doing what is thereby recommended unto him, if he were ſteady to his own Principle, ought to be ſatisfyed with the like Reaſonable Concluſions, in all other matters of Religion.

I ſaid in the *T. N.* that a great deal of the Temple-Worſhip, being Moral Religion, it was as much the Pattern of the Chriſtian, as the Synagogue Worſhip was. And on that account, the Jewiſh Prieſthood might be the Pattern of the Chriſtian Hierarchy.

Mr. *O.* ſays no, becauſe *the Jewiſh Prieſthood was appropriated to the Ceremonial worſhip of the Temple, though they performed the moral parts there alſo.*

Anſ. Though the Jewiſh Prieſthood, and the Temple worſhip, were incumbred with Ceremonies, yet they might be the Pattern of the Chriſtian Prieſthood and Worſhip. An embroidered Garment may be the Pattern of a plain one; They may both be like in ſhape, and in ſubſtance, though not in Ornament, and their Trimming. Beſides, though the *Levitical* Ceremonies were aboliſhed, yet ſome others were ſubſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt, in their room, as Baptiſm, and the Lord's-Supper. But how could the Synagogue (which had no Ceremony at all, only the Moral parts of Religion performed in it) according to Mr. *O's* reaſoning, be a pattern of the Chriſtian Churches, which have Ceremonies? There is as much diſagreement between a Synagogue, which has no Ceremonies, only Natural Religion exerciſed in it, and a Chriſtian Church which has Ceremonies, beſides the natural Religion, as there is between the Temple which had *Levitical* Ceremonies, and the Chriſtian which has not.

Mr. *O.* argues, *that the Legal Prieſts, and Altar, and Prieſthood were changed.*

Anſ. True, as to the *Levitical* Ceremonies: But not as to any thing which was Moral: And Government, I conceive, is a part of Moral Religion: though therefore a *Levitical* Ceremonial High-Prieſt was not ordained for the Chriſtian Church, yet in Imitation of the Jewiſh Eccleſiaſtical Government, a Chriſtian High Prieſt, might be appointed, the Ceremonies of the Law being laid aſide.

Mr. *O.* "The Moral Worſhip in the Synagogues might be performed by ſuch "as were no Prieſts.

Anſ. And will Mr. *O.* therefore aſſert, that any Man may in a Chriſtian Publick Congregation, perform the Moral parts of Worſhip? This very Obſervation of Mr. *O's*, ſhews that the Synagogues were not the Pattern of Chriſtian

Churches

Churches or Congregations; becauſe I take it for granted, that none among us can perform, even Moral Worſhip, in Publick, except Deacons, Presbyters, and Biſhops. It rather, therefore, imports that the Temple Worſhip is the Pattern of the Chriſtian: Becauſe, as none but the Prieſts and *Levites*, could perform the Moral Worſhip in the Temple (2 *Chron.* 30.27. *Nehem.* 9. 5. *Joel* 2. 17.) Even ſo among us, none can, except Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons.

I ſhall defer my Anſwer to Mr. *O*'s Diſcourſes about *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, to the Reply, which I intend unto his *Plea*, Judging that the moſt proper place. We are then now to Treat of *Titus*, and enquire whether he was the Supreme Ruler of the Church in *Crete*, by the appointment of *Paul*. I had affirmed in *T. N.* and (I think) prov'd it. But,

Mr. *O.* "tells us, *It's no where ſaid that* Paul *made* Titus *Biſhop of* Crete.

Anſ. It is ſufficient to me, that *Paul* committed to him, the Supreme Governing Powers over that Church. I contend not about the word *Biſhop*. On the other ſide, I retort, that 'tis no where ſaid, that *Paul* ordained or conſtituted any one Presbyter in *Crete*: will it follow that he made none at all.

Mr. *O.* Titus *was left in* Crete, *but for a Seaſon, perhaps not above half a Year*, Paul *charging him to come to him unto* Nicopolis, &c. *Tit.* 3. 12.

Anſ. According to my *Hypotheſis*, it might be ſome Years after *Paul*'s leaving *Crete*, that he ſent for him unto *Nicopolis*. The Apoſtle, as I ſuppoſe, left him at *Crete*, as he ſailed from *Italy* to *Judæa*, after his releaſe from his firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*: and long after, as he was returning to *Italy*, he ſent for him to *Nicopolis*. If this be once proved (as I promiſe) then *Titus* was not left in *Crete* for a Seaſon. But according to Mr. *O*'s *Hypotheſis*, I cannot imagine that *Titus* could have been left in *Crete* half a Month, far enough ſhort of half a Year, and too ſhort a time to *ſet in Order the* *Tit.* 1. 5.
things that were lacking, *To ordain Elders in every City*, *To ſtop the* 11. 13.
Mouths of falſe Teachers, *To rebuke 'em*, *and that with all Au-* 2. 15.
thority: *In a Word*, *To reject Hereticks, after a ſecond Admonition.* 3. 10.
This ſurely was above a Months Work, or indeed *half a Years*. It implies a permanent and continued Employment. I ſaid, according to Mr. *O*'s *Hypotheſis*, *Titus* had not ſufficient time for the Work whereunto he was appointed. For he attended *Paul* from *Achaia* unto *Macedonia*, and ſo into *Aſia*, till they arrived at *Jeruſalem*; of all which I ſhall have occaſion to treat more punctually in the Fourth Chapter. However it cannot (I own) be denied, that *Paul* called *Titus* from *Crete*, and, by conſequence, it will be ſaid, he was not the fixt Ruler (or Biſhop) there.

Anſ. The reſident Governors of Churches, in the Apoſtles days, were not ſo tyed to their Poſts, that they might not, on any account whatever, ſtir thence. It is not to be doubted, but that they removed for a while, at the Apoſtle's call, and for the furtherance of the Goſpel, unto other places, and afterwards returned to their Reſidence again. I do ſuppoſe, *Titus* went to St. *Paul* at *Nicopolis*, and thence with him unto *Rome*: That as he returned back unto *Crete*, by the Apoſtle's direction, he took *Dalmatia* in his way 2 *Tim.* 4. 10.
to plant the Goſpel there, or to confirm the Churches: What became of him afterward, cannot be known from Scripture, the Divine Hiſtory of the Church of *Crete* reaching no further. But if we will hearken (as in Reaſon we ought) unto what is delivered in the Church-Hiſtory, we muſt ac-

knowledge that *Titus* returned into *Crete*: For there he died and was buried. And I hope Mr. *O.* who ſeems to have a due Regard unto the Fathers, and ſo frequently quotes 'em, for the ſupport of his own Opinions, will take notice of this Evidence.

Paulini poem. 27. p. 169. Sophron. & Hierom. in Cat. Scrip. Eccleſ.

Mr. *O.* here tells us, That, *the Elders in* Crete *were choſen by the Multitude, before they were ordained by Titus,* grounding himſelf upon, *Act.* 14. 23. where χειροτονήσαντες is the word uſed, and is rendered *Ordained*, but implies *chooſing*.

Anſ. Although this is not to the Point here debated, yet, leſt I ſhould be thought to over-ſlip a Difficulty, I anſwer, That there is not in the Epiſtle to *Titus*, the leaſt intimation of the Multitudes chuſing the Elders, but the contrary rather, the Qualifications and fitneſs of the *Candidates*, unto that good Office; being left unto the judgment of *Titus*. Nor does it appear, in *Acts* 14. 23. that the Multitude choſe thoſe Elders, there ſpoken of. For if χειροτονεῖν in this place ſignifies *Ordaining*; then here's not one word of chooſing 'em; but if it ſignifies *chooſing*, then were the Two Apoſtles, *Paul* and *Barnabas*, the Electors, as well as the Ordainers. Why not? So God firſt without the ſuffrage of the People, choſe the Twelve Apoſtles (*Act.* 10. 41.) where the ſame word is uſed, προκεχειροτονημένοις; and then Ordained 'em, *Act.* 2. by anointing 'em with the Spirit. Nor is Mr. *O.* miſtaken, when he imagines me *Dreaming*, that after Ordination, *Titus* aſſigned thoſe Elders ſome new Powers, which I think is intimated in the word καταστήσῃς, which does not properly ſignify to Ordain, but pre-ſuppoſes Ordination, and imports the placing of thoſe Elders in their particular Stations. And this, I believe, is diſtinct from their Ordination.

Def. p. 121.

Mr. *O.* after a tedious Diſcourſe about Evangeliſts (of which number he reckons *Timothy* and *Titus*) having contended that were unfixt Officers of the Church (of which more hereafter) believes it *a degrading them, who had a general Power over all the Churches, to tie 'em to Reſidence in one particular Church, making Ordinary Officers of 'em.*

Anſ. I do not apprehend this to be a degrading them. For whilſt they continued the Companions and Fellow-Labourers of the Apoſtles, and unfixt Officers of the Church, they cannot properly be ſaid to have *had a general power over all Churches*, but were continually at the beck and Command of the Apoſtles, to diſpatch ſuch Orders, as were from time to time given them. As they had no certain place of Reſidence, ſo neither had they any certain work, but were like Reformades in an Army, who have nothing to do, but what the General by a ſpecial Order employs 'em in upon ſudden Occaſions. If it be allowable, *magnis componere parva*, to explain the Condition of the unfixt Evangeliſts, by an Inſtance well known in this County Palatine of *Lancaſter*, they were like to our *Itinerant* Preachers, founded by *Q. Elizabeth* of Famous Memory. Theſe have a Power from the Biſhop of the Dioceſs, to Preach, &c. in any Church, or Chappel within the ſaid County, as his Lordſhip ſhall direct them, or they know is neceſſary and convenient to the Service of the Reformation. They have a general Power to Preach in the Churches in *Lancaſhire*. Now if the Biſhop fixes them in ſome Rectory or Vicarage, no Man will ſay they are degraded, though the Exerciſe of their Miniſtery is brought into a narrower Compaſs

paſs than before. But I have ſpent more Words on this ſlight Objection, than it deſerves.

APPENDIX.

MR *O.* Whereas I affirm'd, that καταστήσῃς ought properly to have been rendered, appoint, or conſtitute, and ſettle, or place them, pre-ſuppoſing at the ſame time their Ordination, he hence concludes, *I give up one of* Titus's *main Powers*, adding, *If this Text proves not* Titus *his Ordaining Power, no one in that Epiſtle doth.* *Tit.* 1. 5. *T. N.* p. 64.

Anſ. But Mr. *O.* forgets that himſelf, as well as the Rector, have all along taken it for granted, that whatever Powers were committed to *Timothy*, were alſo given unto *Titus*, and reciprocally, what to *Titus*, were committed to *Timothy*. Beſides, I take it to be out of Controverſy, that he, to whom any one Part of Supreme Power is given, is to be underſtood as inveſted with all: Conſequently if *Titus* was to appoint where every Presbyter was to officiate, he then had the Power of Ordination alſo. As in like manner, though *Timothy* had no expreſs Commiſſion to *reject Hereticks after the ſecond Admonition*, yet becauſe *Titus* had that Power, ſo had *Timothy* likewiſe. In ſhort, *Titus* had Authority to *receive Accuſations*, and *to rebuke openly*, as well as *Timothy*, had 1 Epiſt. to *Tim.* 5. and *Timothy* to excommunicate the Contumacious, as well as *Titus* had, *Ch.* 3. 10. and both had power to ordain, becauſe one had.

CHAP. IV.

Being An Anſwer to Mr. O's 4th Chap.

THE Queſtion here is, whereas St. *Paul* gave *Timothy* thoſe ample Commiſſions and Inſtructions, that we read of in his firſt Epiſtle, concerning the Government of the *Epheſian* Church, ſome time after he had *beſought him to abide ſtill at* Epheſus, *when he went into* Macedonia, 1 *Epiſt.* 1. 3. What was that preciſe time of *Paul*'s going into *Macedonia*, and beſeeching *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*? In the *Tent. Nov.* following Biſhop *Pearſon*, I reſolved this Queſtion thus, " That *Paul*'s Journey, here ſpoken of, could not be meant of any of thoſe " mentioned in the Acts of the Apoſtles; that therefore it muſt be ſome other, " after his bidding the Elders of *Epheſus* Farewel: That coming to *Jeruſalem*, " he was there made Priſoner, and thence carried to *Rome*, where he continued about 2 Years in Bonds: That being at length releaſed, he returned in-

" to

" to the Eaſtern Parts again, viſiting the Churches; and then as he paſſed out of " *Aſia*, into *Macedonia*, beſought *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, as the fixt Ruler, " or Biſhop of that Church; And ſhortly, after diſpatched the 1ſt Epiſtle to " him. That *Paul* himſelf, ſome while after, went back into *Italy*, and unto the " utmoſt parts of the Weſt, Preaching the Goſpel, and being at length once " more got unto *Rome*, was there Impriſoned a ſecond time, when he wrote the " ſecond Epiſtle to *Tim.* a little before he was Beheaded. We are now to conſider Mr. *O*'s Objections againſt all this.

Def. p. 122. Mr. *O.* " *To abide ſtill*, doth not imply a continued Reſi- " dence: But may ſignify a ſhort ſtay, *Act.* 17. 14, 15. by " Conſequence he was not the fixt Biſhop (Ruler) of *Epheſus*.

Anſ. There is a great difference between [illegible] here, and [illegible] *Act.* 17. 14, 15. The former implies a continued ſtay at *Epheſus*, the latter only ſignifies *Silas* and *Timothy*'s halting, that is, tarrying behind *Paul* at *Beræa*. Beſides, we have no account of *Timothy*'s ſudden remove from *Epheſus*: But we have of *Timothy*'s leaving *Beræa* ſoon after, *Act.* 18. 5. 1 *Theſ.* 3. 2. Laſtly, the Orders given unto *Timothy*, at *Epheſus*, were many and Important, which alſo required time to be executed, which does not appear to have been the Caſe of *Timothy* at *Beræa*.

Mr. *O.* "*Timothy*'s ſtay there (at *Epheſus*) was but ſhort, that is, until the A- " poſtle came to him, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. *ch.* 4. 13.

Anſ. There is no Colour of Argument in this. It is not ſaid, he muſt tarry no longer there, than till *Paul* came to him; Nor can that be the meaning; For then it would follow, that *Timothy* was to *give attendance to Reading, to Exhortation, and to Doctrine*, but till the Apoſtle came to him: Which (I hope) Mr. *O.* will not affirm. Beſides, *Paul* was not certain of his going to *Epheſus ſhortly*; Therefore he adds, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15 ——— *If I tarry long*, &c. from which Paſſages I gather, That *Paul*, at his firſt beſeeching of *Timothy*, to abide at *Epheſus*, thought his Inſtructions not full enough, and therefore intended to ſee *Timothy*, *ſhortly* at *Epheſus*, and to furniſh him with further Orders, how he ought to *behave himſelf in the Houſe of God*, the Church of *Epheſus* committed to him: But becauſe he ſuſpected he might *tarry long*, he therefore in the mean while ſent him this Epiſtle: All which ſhews, that *Timothy* was deſigned for the fixt Ruler of *Epheſus*. Although the Apoſtle reſolved to viſit him there *ſhortly*: Not to remove him thence, but to give him fuller Directions about the management of the Government of the Church.

Mr. *O.* "He was not fixt as Reſident at *Epheſus*, becauſe, the Apoſtle after- " ward called him to *Rome*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9. 21.

Anſ. I will take an Opportunity by and by, to Diſcourſe about Reſidence, where the weakneſs of this Objection will fully appear. In the Interim I'll only acquaint the Reader, that according to Mr. *O*'s own *Hypotheſis*, it could not be leſs than between three and four Years, after the writing of the firſt Epiſtle, that *Paul* ſent for *Timothy* unto *Rome*, and according unto mine, about ſix Years, which is a conſiderable ſtay, or Reſidence in one Place. I ſay, further that *Paul*'s ſending for *Timothy* to *Rome*, is no Argument that *Timothy* for ever quitted that Poſt: That he returned back to *Epheſus*, muſt be made appear from Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, the Scripture going no further, in the Account of *Paul* and *Timothy*, than

than that, in the ſecond Epiſtle *Sophronius*, or *Jerom* * Witneſs that he was Martyr'd at *Epheſus*, and *Photius* † acquaints us, with the time and Occaſion, *viz*. At the deteſtable Feſtival called the *Catagogium*, which *Timothy* would have had abrogated. Laſtly, ſuppoſing *Timothy* never returned back to *Epheſus*, it's no conſequence, that he was not by *Paul* conſtituted reſident Biſhop (Ruler) of *Epheſus*, as will afterwards, in theſe Papers, appear.

* *Catal. Scr.*
† *Cod.* 254. *Col.* 1041. Mr. *Bur.*

Mr. *O.* Objects againſt the time aſſign'd (in *T. N.*) of *Paul's* going into *Macedonia*, after his Releaſe from his firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*, that is, after the Hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles, wherein no mention is made of this Voyage, as I aſſert; againſt this (I ſay) Mr. *O.* Objects, *That nothing can be concluded from* Luke's *ſilence in this Point: For 'tis certain that he doth not mention all the Journies of* Paul *and* Timothy. *Def.* p. 124.

Anſ. I readily grant that bare ſilence is no good Proof, without ſome other conſiderations to ſupport it; and I alſo grant, that *Luke* mentions not all *Paul* and *Timothy's* Journeys: But I contend that he Omits none of *Paul's* from the 13*th* Chapter unto the end of the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, as any impartial Man will believe, if he carefully reads that part of the Hiſtory. And for proof of this, I ſhall at preſent content my ſelf with the acknowledgement and Teſtimony of *Beza* himſelf, who thus writes particularly as to *Paul's* Journeys into *Macedonia*——*Ter omnino vidit* Macedoniam Paulus, *ut ex hiſtoria filo apparet. Quamvis enim non omnia perſcripſerit Lucas, ita tamen contextam hiſtoriam eſſe apparet, ut non plures profectiones in* Macedoniam *poſſint conſtitui.* Paul *ſaw* Macedonia, *but thrice, as is manifeſt from the Hiſtory, as 'tis cloſely laid together by* Luke. *For though he remembers not all things, and every little movement of the Apoſtle, yet his Hiſtory appears ſo contrived, that more Journies of his into* Macedonia *cannot be aſſigned or allow'd.* I do not indeed believe that St. *Luke* has ſet down within the time mention'd, every *Step* the Apoſtle made by the by, unto Towns, and Villages near at hand. While *Paul* was at *Corinth*, 'tis to me out of Controverſy, that he went into the Neighbouring places, Preaching the Goſpel, though *Luke* has not told us ſo. There were Chriſtians, and a Church at *Cenchrea*, *Rom.* 16. 1. where doubtleſs the Apoſtle had taught the Word of God: but *Luke* omitted this. Nevertheleſs, 'tis ſenſeleſs to think, the Hiſtorian ſhould forget ſo conſiderable a Voyage, as this of *Paul's* going from *Epheſus*, unto *Macedonia*, and leaving *Timothy* behind him. But that which I further add, is, That I do not rely barely on St. *Luke's* ſilence, but obſerve, that in his Hiſtory, he has left no room for St. *Paul's* placing *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, at any of thoſe three times, when he went into *Macedonia*. And if this be well prov'd, as has been, and ſhall be once more, then another Journey of *Paul's* into *Macedonia* muſt be ſearched for, and I do believe may be, and has been found out. In order to make out all this, let us firſt examine the Miniſters *Hypotheſis*.

In Diſſertat. de Serie & Succeſſ. p. 75.

Mr. *O's Hypotheſis* is this, "That St. *Paul* at *Epheſus*, ſent "*Timothy* to *Macedonia*, and *Corinth*. *Act.* 19. 21, 22. expecting him back at *Epheſus*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 10, 11. that 'tis moſt likely, *Timothy* "went back to *Paul*, at *Epheſus*, where the Apoſtle left him, when he went "into *Macedonia*, *Act.* 20. *v.* 1. which (as Mr. *O.* thinks) is the meaning of that, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *Def.* p. 124.

My

My buſineſs then is to prove, That this could not be. In order whereunto I muſt give here an exact Narrative of *Paul* from the time of his two Years ſtay at *Epheſus*, unto his bidding the Elders farewell, at *Miletus*, in his Paſſage towards *Jeruſalem*; from whence it will appear plainly, that *Paul* could not leave *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, at that time, when he went into *Macedonia*, mentioned, *Act*. 20. 1.

Paul having Reſided at *Epheſus* two Years (*Act*. 19. 10.) (and perhaps more) *purpoſed in Spirit to paſs through* Macedonia, *to* Achaia, *thence to* Jeruſalem, *and ſo to* Rome (*v*. 21.). Some while before he departed from *Epheſus*, news came to him of the Schiſm at *Corinth*, which occaſioned his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. That the Apoſtle ſent this Letter from *Epheſus*, is manifeſt from 1 *Cor*. 16. 8, 19. That *Timothy* carried this Letter, appears from Chapter 4. 17. *Ch*. 16. 10. and that *Timothy* at the ſame time, had received Orders from the Apoſtle, to go into *Macedonia*, may be ſeen *Act*. 19. 22. St. *Paul* reſolving to tarry at *Epheſus*, or in *Aſia*, *for a Seaſon*, that is, till *Pentecoſt*, 1 *Cor*. 16. 8. Now becauſe *Paul* deſigned to tarry in *Aſia* but *for a Seaſon*, that is, *till Pentecoſt*, and becauſe in his Letter to the *Corinthians*, he promiſes *to come to them ſhortly*, *Ch*. 4. 19. it cannot be doubted, but *Timothy* ſet forth on this Journey from *Epheſus* to *Macedonia*, and ſo to *Corinth* in the Spring about *Eaſter*, in the Month of *March*. *Paul*'s ſtay therefore at *Epheſus*, after *Timothy*'s Departure, was about ſix Weeks. The Apoſtle then leaving *Epheſus* at *Whitſontide*, came to *Troas* (2 *Cor*. 2. 12.) thence unto *Macedonia* (*ch*. 7. 5.) where the long expected *Titus* met him, *ch*. 7. 6. *Timothy* alſo came to him in *Macedonia*, and joined with him in the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* (*ch*. 1. 1.) *Paul* and *Timothy*, having ſpent ſome Month, in *Macedonia*, gathering the Contributions, and *exhorting* the Brethren (*Act*. 20. 2.) unto Liberality, as I ſuppoſe, ſet forward for *Greece*, where they tarried all the three Winter Months, *Act*. 20. 2, 3. that is *Wintered* at *Corinth*, as the Apoſtle had promiſed, 1 *Cor*. 16. 6. During his ſtay here, *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, *ch*. 15. 25, 26. *Timothy* being then with him, *ch*. 16. 21. Early in the Spring, as the Apoſtle was about to ſail from *Corinth* to *Syria*, and ſo to paſs forward unto *Jeruſalem*, as he had before laid his Journey, he ſuddenly altered his Purpoſe; the Occaſion whereof was the Jews lying in Wait for Him. So he returned into *Macedonia*, ſending *Timothy* before him, whom neverthleſs he overtook at *Troas*. Hence *Paul* and his Company haſted unto *Miletus*, where the Apoſtle calling to him the Elders of *Epheſus*, bid 'em Farewel. *Act*. 20. 3, 5, 6, 15, 17. The Arguments I raiſe hence againſt Mr. *O*'s *Hypotheſis* are as follow.

1. Here is not ſufficient time for *Timothy*'s Journey from *Epheſus* to *Macedonia*, ſo to *Corinth*, and back again to *Paul* at *Epheſus*, before the Apoſtle departed thence. According to Mr. *Berry*'s Maps, *Corinth* is diſtant from *Epheſus*, above 500 * *Italian*, or *Engliſh* Miles, if one travel by *Troas*, and through *Macedonia*: So that backward and forward, *Timothy* muſt have gone more than a Thouſand Miles in ſix weeks time, beſides croſſing the Sea, that's to ſay, 30 † Miles a day, which is incredible, eſpecially if it be conſidered, that he had much Buſineſs to diſpatch, both in *Macedonia* and at *Corinth*: And Mr. *O*. will not, I ſuppoſe, allow that he travelled on the Lord's-Days.

* Near 700.

† Or 38.

Againſt

Againſt this it will be objected, That *Paul* looked for *Timothy* back at *Epheſus*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 11. and that the length of the Journey ought not to be pleaded againſt ſo good an Evidence of the Matter of Fact.

Anſ. I deny that St. *Paul* expected *Timothy* back at *Epheſus*, but in *Macedonia* rather: The Words are—*That he may come unto me, for I look for him.* But whether at *Epheſus* where he then was, or in *Macedonia*, where he hoped *ſhortly* to be, is not ſaid. Now *Paul* had juſt before advertiſed the *Corinthians*, *I do paſs through Macedonia*, v. 5. and doubtleſs he had told *Timothy* as much before: He departed from *Epheſus*, *Acts* 19. Beſides when *Paul* at *Epheſus* wrote his firſt Epiſtle to the *Cor.* he at that very time reſolved to tarry *in Aſia but for a Seaſon.* *Acts* 19. 22. and to go unto *Corinth ſhortly*, 1 *Ep.* 4. 19. 'Tis then moſt probable that *Timothy* was to meet *Paul*, in *Macedonia*, and that the Apoſtle expected him there, and there we find 'em together at the writing of the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*.

2. There was no occaſion for *Timothy*'s going back unto *Paul* at *Epheſus*, and tarrying there after the Apoſtle was departed unto *Macedonia*. St. *Paul* had himſelf ſettled that Church of *Epheſus*, and left it in good Order. He had furniſhed it with Presbyters and able Miniſters. There were among them as yet no Wolves, no Vipers, no falſe Teachers, who deſerved to be brought before *Timothy*, and *Rebuked openly* for their diſorderly walking. Thus it was at *Paul*'s departure, and thus it continued ſome time after: Even when the Apoſtle the next year called together the Elders at *Miletus*, all was ſtill well among 'em. The Apoſtle makes no complaint to the contrary, nor had he any reaſon for it. Why then ſhould *Timothy* be put unto ſuch an unreaſonable Fatigue, when there was nothing for him to do, at *Epheſus*? And yet,

3. (As we read in the firſt Epiſtle to *Tim.*) there was much Buſineſs, and more than he could diſpatch, in that little time allowed for his ſtay there by Mr. *O.* There is the more force in this Argument, becauſe the Apoſtle at his Writing the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, ſoon after from *Macedonia*, hopes to be with him at *Epheſus ſhortly*, (1 *Ep.* 3. 14.) Was *Timothy* left at *Epheſus*, in the Apoſtle's room to diſcharge ſo many important Matters, as are reckoned up in that Epiſtle, and yet the Apoſtle intend to return unto *Epheſus ſhortly*; and ſerve him with a Writ of Eaſe? It is incredible.

4. *Paul*'s hopes of returning *ſhortly*, from *Macedonia* unto *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. according to Mr. *O*'s *Hypotheſis*, are wholly Inconſiſtent with his former Purpoſes of going from *Epheſus* to *Macedonia*, ſo to *Achaia*, and thence to *Syria* by Sea, and ſo to *Jeruſalem*: For we read that he ſtill continued in that mind after Winter, *Act.* 20. 3. which ſhews plainly that the Apoſtle after his leaving *Epheſus*, neither intended nor hoped to ſee it any more at this time. He did not then write his 1ſt. Epiſtle to *Tim.* whilſt he was now in *Macedonia*, newly come from *Epheſus*, becauſe he could not then think of returning to *Epheſus ſhortly*, his Journey to *Jeruſalem* being then laid quite another way, and by Conſequence he did not leave nor beſeech *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, at this his departure thence into *Macedonia*.

5. *Paul* was in great haſt to gather the Collections in *Macedonia* and *Achaia*, that he might bring them to *Jeruſalem*, by the next *Pentecoſt*, *if it were poſſible*, *Act.* 20. 16. In ſo great haſt, that being at *Troas* in his way to *Macedonia*, though *a Door was opened unto him*, that is, though he had a Proſpect of Converting ma-

ny Souls unto God, yet he refuſed to tarry; But ſet forward immediately unto *Macedonia*, 2 *Cor*. 2. 12, 13. How then can it be imagined that he deſigned or hoped to return *ſhortly* unto *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, when he would not tarry a while at *Troas*, no not though he ſaw his Preaching would have effect among thoſe People? and at the ſame time aimed to paſs unto *Jeruſalem*, through *Syria* by Sea, as *before is noted*.

6. If *Timothy* (as Mr. *O.* Imagines) returned unto *Paul* at *Epheſus*, before his Departure thence for *Macedonia*, about *Pentecoſt*, the Apoſtle had had no Occaſion of being *reſtleſs* at *Troas*, 2 *Cor*. 2. 13. Nor in *Macedonia*, *Ch*. 7. 5, 6. becauſe of *Titus coming not to him* from *Corinth*. Was St. *Paul* troubled about *Titus*, whether he was Well and in Health? or earneſt to know how the Contributions at *Corinth* went on? or curious to hear what Effect his Firſt Chiding Letter had on the *Corinthians*? *Timothy* if he had reached *Paul* at *Epheſus*, had certainly ſatisfy'd his Curioſity, in all theſe things. But ſeeing he was reſtleſs and uneaſy, both at *Troas* and in *Macedonia*, upon ſome or all the foreſaid Accounts, after he had left *Epheſus*, 'tis certain *Timothy* came not to him at *Epheſus*, and by conſequence he left not *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, when he went to *Macedonia* at that time, nor then beſought him to abide there.

7. If *Paul* left *Timothy* at *Epheſus* now, at his departure thence unto *Macedonia*, 'tis Plain, *Timothy* abode there but a very ſmall while: For he was preſently with *Paul* in *Macedonia* again, which is not at all agreeable to the Buſineſs, St. *Paul* afterward in his Letter committed to *Timothy*'s Charge. The Caſe between them ſtood thus. *Paul* deſired *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, hoping doubtleſs and deſigning to be back with him in a little time. But becauſe the Apoſtle had not yet given *Timothy* all the neceſſary Orders, nor ſufficient Inſtructions, how he ſhould behave himſelf in the Adminiſtration of the Eccleſiaſtical Government at *Epheſus*, and becauſe he foreſaw it might however happen to be *long* e'er he came to *Timothy* there, he therefore ſends unto him this Epiſtle full of Directions, how he ſhould *behave himſelf in the Houſe of God, the Church*. These things manifeſtly ſhew that *Timothy* was intended to tarry a good while at *Epheſus*, and till *Paul* came to him, 1 *Epiſt*. 4. 13. although it ſhould happen to be *long*: And likewiſe to continue there, though *Paul* had come to him *ſhortly*. If *Paul* had been certain of his returning *ſhortly* to *Timothy* at *Epheſus*: He had not ſent him this Epiſtle: For ſo 'tis intimated, 1 *Tim*. 3. 14, 15. *Theſe things write I unto thee hoping to come unto thee ſhortly*: But becauſe they had been needleſs, or might have been thought ſo, if *Paul* had been certain of his going unto him *ſhortly*. He therefore adds b way of excuſe; *But if I tarry long* (as perhaps I may) *I therefore write theſe things unto th e, that thou may'ſt know how thou oughteſt to behave thy ſelf* in the Charg ,which I have committed unto thee. This is not at all conſiſtent with *Timothy*'s being ſuddenly after with *Paul* in *Macedonia*, 2 *Cor*. 1. 1. If ſo, why ſhould the Apoſtle talk of coming to him at *Epheſus ſhortly*; and, if it happen'd otherwiſe, write to him concerning his Behaviour in the Government of the Church? But let us deſcend unto particulars. In the firſt of *Tim*. and 5*th* Chapter, the Apoſtle inſtructs him *to reward the Elders that Rule well with double honour*, eſpecially if they alſo *labour'd in the Word and Doctrine*, v. 17. to hear Complaints made againſt Elders and examine Witneſſes, v. 19. to *rebuke* offending Elders openly, as he found Cauſe, or to acquit 'em, if the Accuſation

1 *Tim*. 3. 14, 15.

was

was not ſufficiently proved againſt 'em, *v.* 20. and to Ordain Elders, as need required, *v.* 22. All which implies that *Timothy* was deſigned to continue at *Ephesus* ſome conſiderable time: whereas according to Mr. *O*'s Hypotheſis *Timothy* tarryed not at *Ephesus* till *Paul* came to him, but went to *Paul* in *Macedonia*, ſoon after the receipt of this Epiſtle, which is incredible, and (as I ſaid) inconſiſtent with the Inſtructions aforeſaid contained in the Epiſtle.

8 *Timothy* accordingly did abide at *Epheſus* a conſiderable time, as appears from the Apoſtles ſecond Epiſtle, which is very agreeable to my Hypotheſis, but not at all to Mr. *O*'s. Nay but,

Mr. *O.* will ſay the ſecond Epiſtle was ſent to *Timothy* from *Rome*, in the time of *Paul*'s firſt Impriſonment. The Apoſtle going from *Miletus* to *Jeruſalem*, had left him there, or thereabouts in *Aſia*; and therefore this ſecond Epiſtle proves not that *Timothy* continued at *Epheſus*, a good while after *Paul* left him there, *Paul* ſending for him to *Rome*.

Anſ. It ſhall e'er I make an end, once more be Demonſtrated (under Mr. *O*'s favour, I ſay, Demonſtrated) that the ſecond Epiſtle was wrote in *Paul*'s ſecond Bonds at *Rome*. Mean-while Mr. *O*'s Aſſertion, that *Timothy* went not with *Paul* to *Jeruſalem*, but tarryed behind in *Aſia*, is ſupported by no probable Circumſtance in Scripture. It muſt be confeſt, that St. *Luke* no where expreſly tells us, that *Timothy* accompanied *Paul* thither. But there is no force in this; becauſe *Luke* mentions none of the Apoſtle's other Companions, who went along with Him, with the Contributions unto *Jeruſalem*, except *Trophimus*. Nevertheleſs it cannot be doubted but many accompanied him, not only to *Jeruſalem*, but to *Rome* alſo, who nevertheleſs are omitted by *Luke*. To ſay nothing of *Luke* himſelf, *Coloſ.* 4. 14. *Philem.* 24. *Tychicus* was one, *Eph.* 6. 21. *Coloſ.* 4. 7. and *Titus* another, who is never once named by St. *Luke* in the whole Book of the *Acts*, and yet doubtleſs went with *Paul* from *Corinth*, and ſo to *Jeruſalem*, and thence to *Rome*: in proof whereof, ſee 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. *And not that only, but who was alſo choſen of the Churches, to travel with us with this Grace or Gift, the* Corinthians *Charity*: which Words of St. *Paul* are to be underſtood of *Titus*, not of *Luke* mentioned in the precedent Verſe. The precedent Verſe being caſt out, or put into a Parentheſis, thus the 17th and 19th Verſes will run—" *For indeed He* " (Titus) *accepted the Exhortation, but being more forward of his own accord He* " *went in to you, and that only* (that is, he did not only accept my Exhortation, and " went willing of himſelf, but over and above) *He was alſo Choſen of the Churches* " *to travel with us, with this Grace.* For the Apoſtle is here profeſſedly writing in the Commendation of *Titus*, and mentions *Luke* but by the bye: and *Titus* was the Perſon, who took moſt Pains in forwarding the Collections at *Corinth*, for which Reaſon, 'tis moſt Rational to believe, he was Choſen for one to carry them. Nor am I ſingular in this Expoſition, Sir *Norton Knatchbul*, in the *Synopſis*, differs but very little from me, correcting the Parentheſis thus—*Miſimus cum eo fratrem* (*cujus laus*, &c.) *cum hoc miniſterio ſive dono*, implying, that both *Titus* and *Luke*, were ſent with the *Corinthians* Liberality unto *Jeruſalem*. I will not take upon me to Vindicate this Gentleman's Correction of the Text, but he plainly ſhews, that he thought *Titus* went along with the Contributions to *Jeruſalem*, which is all I contend for. There are the ſame Reaſons to believe *Timothy* attended *Paul* to *Jeruſalem*, and then to *Rome*.

1. Becauſe *Timothy* was employ'd by St. *Paul*, to promote the Collections in *Macedonia*, as *Titus* in *Achaia* (For that was his Errand, I make account when *Paul* ſent him into *Macedonia*, *Act.* 19. 22.) And we ought in Reaſon to believe *Timothy* was join'd in the Commiſſion, for carrying the Relief unto *Jeruſalem*, ſince he had been imploy'd in forwarding and Collecting them. This the rather becauſe.

2. We read He was with *Paul* at *Rome* in the Apoſtle's firſt Impriſonment, doubtleſs accompanying *Paul* thither from *Miletus*, and *Jeruſalem*, *Heb.* 13. 2, 3. *Philip.* 1. 1. *Coloſ.* 1. 1. Now then if *Timothy* went along with *Paul*, to *Jeruſalem*, and to *Rome*, then he could not continue at *Epheſus*, or in *Aſia*, a conſiderable time, neither was the ſecond Epiſtle written to him, in the Apoſtles firſt Impriſonment, as Mr. *O.* ſuppoſes.

Having (as I hope) given irrefragable Arguments, that *Paul* at his going into *Macedonia* mentioned, *Acts* the 20. 1. did not then leave *Timothy* behind at *Epheſus*, beſeeching Him to abide there, I will now conſider, when it was, that the Apoſtle left *Titus* in *Crete to ſet in order the things that were wanting.* My Opinion is (as I have declared at large in *T. N.*) that *Paul* being Releaſed from his firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*, and returning into the Eaſt, as he promiſed or hinted in ſeveral of his Epiſtles, writ to 'em from *Rome*, touched at *Crete*, and having laid a Foundation of a Chriſtian Church in that Iſland, proſecuted his Journey Eaſtward, leaving *Titus* behind to perfect it: whom therefore he afterwards furniſhed with Inſtructions about the Government of that Church, in his Epiſtle to *Titus*. Inſtead of this Mr. *O.* Propoſes the Opinion of Dr. *Lightfoot*, which is, *that when* Paul *returned from* Macedonia *to* Greece, Act. 20. 2. *then he left* Titus *there (in* Crete) Tit. 1. 5. *thinking that he ſhould preſently, after a little ſtay in* Greece, *have ſet forwards towards* Jeruſalem. *As he was about to Sail into* Syria, *the Jews laid wait for him, which made him return through* Macedonia, Acts 20. 3. *About that time (as Dr.* Lightfoot *conceives) he writ the Epiſtle to* Titus, *in which he calls him to* Nicopolis, *where he intended to Winter*, Tit. 3. 12. *He had ſome thoughts of Wintering in* Corinth, 1 Cor. 16. 6. *but it ſeems, altering his Reſolution, he determined to Winter in* Nicopolis *a City of* Epirus, *not very far diſtant from* Corinth. Titus *according to appointment came to him, and was thence ſent by him to* Corinth *to haſten the Collections for the Saints in* Judea, 2 *Cor.* 8. 16, 17.

Def. p. 126.

Anſ. Before I come to the main Buſineſs, I muſt take notice of ſeveral miſtakes and Inconſiſtences in this Account.

1. That *Paul* cannot be ſaid to have *returned* from *Macedonia* to *Greece*, whereas yet in this Peregrination he had not been. For *Paul* firſt came from *Epheſus* into *Macedonia*, then went into *Greece*, *Acts* 20. 2. He returned indeed afterward out of *Greece* into *Macedonia* again, *v.* 3. but he did not *return* out of *Macedonia* into *Greece*. But the meaning is, I preſume, and muſt be, as far as I am able to comprehend him, *that* Paul *when (or as) he went from* Macedonia *into* Greece *left* Titus *in* Crete, Tit. 1. 5. which is abſurd, as any one will confeſs, that knows the Geographical Situation of theſe Places.

2. Mr. *O.* thinks that *Paul* intended to Winter at *Nicopolis*: but 'tis evident, he intended to Winter at *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 6. and 'tis as evident, that he did Winter there, *Act.* 20. 3. for he ſtayed there three *Months*.

3. Mr. *O.* ſays, *Paul returned through* Macedonia, *Act.* 20. 3. *about the time as he writ the Epiſtle to* Titus, *in which He calls him to* Nicopolis. But *Paul*'s Return through *Macedonia*, was in the Spring, and He was got to *Philippi* by *Eaſter*, *Act.* 20. 6. How then could he about this time write to *Titus*, and in his Letter call *Titus* to him at *Nicopolis*, where he was determined to Winter, and yet Winter was already paſt.

4. Nicopolis (ſays Mr. *O.*) *a City of* Epirus *not far diſtant from* Corinth. Only about 170. Miles: that's nothing with Mr. *O.* But I have ſhewn that 'tis unlikely *Paul* ſhould at this time determine to Winter at *Nicopolis*, where He had never as yet been, and where there was no Chriſtian Church, that we known of: and 'tis yet more unlikely that the Apoſtle's haſt, whereof we have ſpoken, ſhould permit him to go ſo far directly another way from *Jeruſalem*.

Laſtly, ſays the Miniſter, *Titus* came to *Paul* at *Nicopolis*, and was thence ſent by the Apoſtle to *Corinth* to haſten the Collections. But the miſchief is, *Paul* wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* by *Titus* from *Macedonia* before Winter, before the three Months mentioned, *Acts* 20. 3. and then ſent him to haſten the Collections. Whether Mr. *O.* has done Dr. *Lightfoot* right in this confuſed Account I am not concerned to examine. He has made this his own Hypotheſis, and therefore I all along aſcribe it to him.

Well! letting theſe things paſs, Mr. *O*'s meaning is (I gueſs) that *Paul* going from *Macedonia* into *Greece*, viſited *Crete in his way*, and there left *Titus*.

Anſ. I do not yet underſtand how it can be properly ſaid, that *Paul* as he went from *Macedonia* into *Greece* viſited *Crete in his way*. *Greece* is in the way from *Macedonia* to *Crete*, how then did he viſit *Crete* in the way as he went from *Macedonia* to *Greece*? However, ſometime hereabouts——(Mr. *O.* will ſay) between his leaving *Macedonia*, and ſettling in *Greece*, *Paul* viſited *Crete*, and left *Titus* there, which is the thing I now undertake to diſprove; but will firſt as my Foundation, tell the Story of *Titus*, as exactly as I can gather it from Scripture.

Paul at *Epheſus*, diſpatched *Titus* away to *Corinth* about the Collections, as I conceive, a Year or more before he ſent *Timothy* unto *Macedonia*, as may be gathered, from 2 *Cor.* 8. 6, 10. *chap.* 9. 2. where the Apoſtles teſtifies of the *Corinthians*, that they were *ready a Year ago*. For this Reaſon it was that *Paul* looked and longed for *Titus*'s return, after above a Years abſence. But *Titus* at laſt came to *Paul* in *Macedonia*, and gave him an Account what effect his firſt Epiſtle had upon the *Corinthians*, 2 *Cor.* 7. 6, 7, &c. as alſo of their willingneſs to Contribute towards the Relief of the Poor Saints at *Jeruſalem*, *chap.* 8, 10, 11. *chap.* 9. 2. Hereupon *Paul* (and *Timothy*) writ the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, *Titus* carrying it, 2 *Cor.* 8. 6, 18. I muſt add, here another ſhort account of *Paul*. He left *Epheſus* ſoon after *Pentecoſt*, and arrived (let us imagine) in *June* at *Philippi* in *Macedonia*. There he *gave much Exhortation*, Acts 20. 2. which implies (as I gather) that he ſpent much time in *Macedonia*: let us ſuppoſe he tarry'd there, till about *November*. Then He ſet forward for *Greece* where he abode three Months, *v.* 3. that is till *February*, thence he returned early in the Spring into *Macedonia*, and was got as far back as *Philippi* by *Eaſter*, *v.* 6. and ſo croſt the Sea into *Aſia*, *Act.* 20. This premiſed, my Arguments againſt Mr. *O*'s Hypotheſis are as follow.

1. Here

1. Here is no time that can be aſſigned for *Paul's* ſailing into *Crete*, and there Founding a Church. If it be thought, that during the time which is allowed for his ſtay in *Macedonia*, he might go to *Crete*, that cannot be granted: becauſe *Luke* would doubtleſs have taken notice of ſo conſiderable an Enterprize: and beſides, I do ſuppoſe, *Paul* was too buſy in forwarding the Collections, *and giving much Exhortation*, to undertake ſuch a long Voyage: Laſtly, *Luke* plainly ſays, that *Paul* came from *Macedonia* (not from *Crete*) *into Greece*. If then within the time aſſigned to his ſtay in *Macedonia*, he went to *Crete*, he muſt have returned back again, firſt into *Macedonia*, and then have gone into *Greece*, which is abſurd to ſuppoſe. Nor did he ſail out of *Greece* into *Crete*. For then *Luke* could not have writ, that he abode three Months, in *Greece*, one half of which time muſt at leaſt have been ſpent in that Voyage to and again, and in tarrying there.

2. Nor could *Titus* accompany the Apoſtle thither at this time. *Titus* was ſent alone from *Macedonia* to *Corinth*: His buſineſs at *Corinth*, was to encourage and promote the Contributions, as abundantly appears in the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*.

3. If *Titus* went along with *Paul* unto *Jeruſalem* with the Contributions (as cannot in reaſon be deny'd): how then could he be left in *Crete* to perfect that Church, and ſet in Order the things that were wanting? Surely this required more than two or three Months. *Paul* was two whole Years at leaſt in planting the Church of *Epheſus*; but *Titus* could finiſh that in *Crete* (it ſeems) in as few Months.

4. The great haſt *Paul* was in, and the Multiplicity of buſineſs in *Macedonia*, and *Achaia* that lay on his hands, and the Application wherewith he purſued it, will not ſuffer us to believe, that at this time he undertook ſuch a great, and a new Work, that of the Converſion of the Iſland of *Crete*. At this time all other Concernments of the Church were laid aſide, and gave place unto that of forwarding the Collections, and carrying them to *Judea*.

5. That Paſſage (*Titus* 3. 12.) *when I ſhall ſend unto thee* Artemas *or* Tychicus, *make haſt to come unto me at* Nicopolis: *for I have determined there to Winter*, quite overthrows Mr. *O's* (or Dr. *Lightfoot's*) Hypotheſis: For *Paul* at that time, fix'd by Mr. *O.* neither intended, nor did Winter at *Nicopolis* but at *Corinth*, as has been proved. *Paul* as yet had never been ſo far Weſtward as *Nicopolis* in *Epirus*, to Preach the Goſpel as may be collected, from 2 *Cor.* 10. 14, 16—— *We are come* (ſays the Apoſtle) *as far as to you in Preaching the Goſpel*: but we hope *to Preach the Goſpel in the Regions beyond you*, that is in *Epirus*, which as yet it ſeems he had not done. How then could he intend to Winter at *Nicopolis*? which implies that there were Chriſtians there already, among whom he would Winter: but we know of none as yet in thoſe parts.

6. *Paul* (as has been noted already) was in ſo great haſt to go unto *Jeruſalem*, that he would not loſe any time, no not tarry to Preach the Goſpel at *Troas*, *Though a Door was open unto him*: how then ſhall we believe that he made a Voyage by Sea into *Crete*, to Plant a Church there, when it does not appear he had the leaſt encouragment beforehand, to expect any conſiderable Succeſs, as he had at *Troas*?

7. I

7. I in general before noted, what great buſineſs St. *Paul* had both in *Macedonia* and at *Corinth*; which would not diſpenſe with his Abſence from them. He could not at this time take ſo long a Journey as to *Crete*, about the Converſion of that Iſland, which would require a longer ſtay than he could diſpenſe with: particularly, let it be obſerved, that his work at *Corinth* was more than Ordinary, *viz.* to reduce 'em unto Peace, and Unity, and Order. So he promiſed, 1 *Cor.* 11. 34. *The reſt will I ſet in order when I come.*

Whoever ſhall duly weigh theſe things with a diſintereſted mind, will be convinced, that St. *Paul* at this time of his going from *Epheſus* into *Macedonia*, and *Achaia*, and tarrying there did not, could not beſeech *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, nor yet ſail unto *Crete* to Plant a Church there leaving *Titus* to finiſh it.

Mr. *O.* *Here is no expreſs Proof that* Paul *(after his Releaſe) from his Impriſonment at* Rome) *viſited* Epheſus. *Def.* p. 126.

Anſ. The Rector's Hypotheſis as laid in *T. N.* does not require that *Paul* viſited *Epheſus*. I took notice of Mr. *Bain's* Miſtake, in ſaying or ſuppoſing that *Paul* left *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, as if *Paul* had then been there: but no ſuch thing is to be found, in 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. Beſides I expreſt my Thoughts thus, That *Paul* being at *Troas*, going unto *Macedonia* (as he had ſignified *Philipp.* 1. 25, 26.) then beſought *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*. Not that *Paul* was, at the time of his beſeeching *Timothy*, at *Epheſus*, but at *Troas*: Neither is it neceſſary to ſuppoſe that *Timothy* was then at *Epheſus*: for St. *Paul* might, by Letter beſeech *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, though he had at that preſent been at *Troas* with *Paul*, or *Timothy* in ſome other place. Theſe are unneceſſary Repetitions.

Mr. *O.* Whereas in proof of *Paul*'s return into the Eaſt, after his Enlargement from Priſon, I alledged (2 *Tim.* 4. 20.) *Trophimus's being left at* Miletus *ſick*, &c. the Miniſter replies, "It is moſt likely that *Paul* touched at *Miletus*, when he returned from *Jeruſalem* in "Bonds to *Rome*: 'tis evident he intended to ſail by the Coaſts of *Aſia*, "*Act.* 27. 2. *Def.* p 129.

Anſ. *Intended to Sail*? Surely Mr. *O.* forgets himſelf. *Paul* was now a Priſoner in Bonds, How then could the Apoſtle *intend*? or determine which way the Ship muſt Sail? Our Tranſlation haply, which is not very exact here, betray'd Him into this foul Miſtake —— *Meaning to Sail*, &c. but in the Original, 'tis μέλλοντες, *being about to Sail by the Coaſts of Aſia we* (all in the Ship) *Lanched.* It was not *Paul* and his Brethren, that *meant* or deſigned which way they would Sail; but the Centurion and Maſter of the Ship, who determined that Point. But for the Ships Sailing by the Coaſts of *Aſia*, the Reaſon is plain: for thither the Ship was bound, no further in the way to *Rome*: and therefore they changed their Ship at *Myra*, v. 5. a City of *Lycia*, part of the Southern Coaſts of *Aſia*; and took another belonging to *Alexandria*, ſo Sailing directly into *Italy*, v. 6. It was then neither *Paul*'s Intentions, no nor the Centurions Commands, which brought the Ship by the Coaſts of *Aſia* unto *Myra*, but the Merchants Buſineſs, which indeed lay ſo far in the direct Road unto *Italy*. For every one knows the Ancient way of Sailing, before the Compaſs and Loadſtone were invented, they choſe generally *Legere littus* to Sail by the Coaſts, as much as they ſafely could, and they were generally, all what we now call *Coaſters*. For they had no certain

way

way to Steer directly, from Place to Place, in the open broad Sea, except by the Sun or Stars, which did not always appear: ſo that they were wont to keep within ſight of Land, if poſſible. But I paſs this, and further ſay to Mr. *O.* that 'tis a very abſurd Conjecture to think, that *Paul* in his Voyage touch'd at *Miletus*. As if *Miletus* lay in the way from *Myra* to *Italy*, or as if the Centurion, or the Maſter of the Ship would go out of their way, I know not how many days Sail to accompany *Paul* in viſiting the Churches at and near *Miletus*, when as *Paul* was a Priſoner ſent to *Rome*. The Centurion could never have anſwered it to his Superiours. As for the other two Suppoſitions, that *Miletus* might be a Town in *Crete*, of that name, or the Iſland *Malta*, it cannot be deny'd, that then *Paul* might in his Voyage from *Judea* to *Italy*, have left *Trophimus* in one, or in either of thoſe two places: but what then will become of *Paul*'s having been at *Troas*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 13. and at *Corinth*, *v.* 20? If then he touch'd not at *Troas*, and at *Corinth* in his Paſſage from *Jeruſalem* to *Rome*, (as for the foreſaid reaſons is clear) there is good ground to believe he viſited *Miletus* in *Aſia*, *Philippi*, and other Churches at the time by me aſſigned. This will further be diſputed by and by.

Def. p. 130. After all this Mr. *O.* undertakes directly, to Vindicate the Ancient Chronology, and to prove that the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was written before *Paul*'s meeting, and taking leave of the Elders of *Epheſus*, *Act.* 20.

Anſ. If this were ſubſtantially proved, yet ſtill it will not follow, that *Timothy* was not the Supreme Ruler (Biſhop) of *Epheſus*. For firſt nothing in *Paul*'s Farewell-Sermon, proves the Elders to be the Supreme Governours of that Church, as has already been made out. And as for *Paul*'s taking no notice of *Timothy* in that Farewel Sermon, I muſt retort, that neither did *Paul* mention the Elders, in the Commiſſion given to *Timothy*, in the firſt Epiſtle, which Mr. *O.* ſuppoſes written before that farewel Sermon. There are ſeveral Epiſtles to the Churches, wherein the Presbyters are not mention'd: but it will not thence be concluded that they had no Presbyters at all: much leſs ought it to be gathered, that *Timothy* was not the Supreme Ruler (Biſhop) of *Epheſus*, becauſe he is not ſpoken of in ſo ſhort a Farewel-Speech. But theſe things have been oft enough ſpoken of: let us then hear Mr. *O*'s Arguments proving the firſt of *Timothy* was writ before the Farewell-Sermon.

Def. p. 131. "Mr. *O.* Argues from *Paul*'s excommunicating *Alexander* the "Copper-Smith, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. who is the Perſon mentioned, "*Act.* 19. 33. He "adds, that this Excommunication was not long after his "Apoſtacy, and ſo is mentioned as a late thing.

Anſ. I'll not create Mr. *O.* any unneceſſary trouble: but grant that the ſame Perſon is mentioned in both places. But I muſt ſay, it does not appear that this *Alexander* was a Chriſtian, at the uproar in *Epheſus* mentioned, *Act* 19. The contrary is moſt probable. He is called a *Jew* (not a Chriſtian Believer) *v.* 34. If ſo, then he, who never yet Believed, could not yet be an Apoſtate and Conſequently could not be Excommunicated. But ſay he were a Chriſtian-Jew, it does not appear that he had any hand in raiſing the Tumult againſt *Paul*, or that he Apoſtatized from the Faith at that time. That his Excommunication was not long after his Apoſtacy I eaſily admit: but when he Apoſtatized, I do deſire to be informed, as alſo where or to what Church he belonged, when he Apoſtatized, and was Excommunicated. The moſt likely was the *Epheſian*. Let that

that be ſuppoſed. The Queſtion then is ſtill, when he Apoſtatized, and was Excommunicated? But, the Truth is, we are in the Dark both where and when he Apoſtatized, and by Conſequence know not when *Paul* Excommunicated him. And therefore nothing can be drawn hence in proof of the time of the Apoſtles writing the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*.

Mr. *O.* Puts the Objection againſt himſelf, How came *Timothy* to leave *Epheſus*, and be with *Paul* in *Macedonia*, Act. 20. 4. ſeeing the Apoſtle deſired him to ſtay till he came? 1 *Tim.* 4. 13. *Def.* p. 131.

His Reſolution of this Difficulty is out of Dr. *Lightfoot*, as follows—" *Paul* " deſigning to have Sailed for *Syria*, Acts 20. 3. came near to *Timothy*, and " there diſcovering the Danger laid in his way by the Jews (which alſo might " have involved *Timothy*) he brought him away back with him, and ſo both re" turned again into *Macedonia*, and when Winter was over, they ſet Sail for " *Aſia* again.

Anſ. I'll venture to call this a ſenſeleſs Story, though Mr. *O.* has Fathered it upon the Learned Dr. *Lightfoot*, truly or falſly is no matter to me. For,

1. *Timothy* was not at *Epheſus* when *Paul* was about to go for *Jeruſalem*. He was with *Paul* in *Macedonia*, 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. *Act.* 20. 4. Except Mr. *O.* will affirm, as indeed in the Account He gives of this Matter, he muſt ſuppoſe, that *Timothy* went back from *Corinth*, to *Paul* at *Epheſus*, thence following him to *Macedonia*, then returned to *Epheſus* again, and laſtly, was thence fetched back by the Apoſtle unto *Macedonia* once more, and Wintered with him in *Greece*, and then returned with *Paul* through *Macedonia* to *Miletus*, all which has already been diſproved.

2. It is here implyed by Mr. *O.* that *Paul* attempted to ſail for *Syria*, and *Judea* before Winter, which is inconſiſtent with *Act.* 20. 3. and 1 *Cor.* 16. 6.

3. It is here ſuppoſed that *Paul* deſigned to ſail for *Syria* from *Macedonia*; whereas 'tis plain, it was from *Corinth* or *Greece*, Act. 20. 3. *And there* (in *Greece*) *He abode three Months, and when the Jews laid wait for Him, as he was about to ſail into* Syria, *He purpoſed to return through* Macedonia.

4. It is ſuppoſed that *Paul* was actually ſailing towards *Syria*, and was come near to *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, where He diſcovered the Jews, lying in wait for him. Whereas He had diſcovered the Jews Plot in *Greece*, when He was *about to ſail* or juſt before he took Ship, and therefore alter'd his purpoſe, and returned 'tis not ſaid *into Macedonia* (though that's true) but *through Macedonia* into *Aſia*, *v.* 4.

5. 'Tis ſuppoſed that *Paul* deſigned to take Ship for *Syria* before Winter, or before it was over: which cannot be: becauſe He Winter'd at *Corinth*, *Act.* 20. 3. compared with 1 *Cor.* 16. 6. or at *Nicopolis*, as Mr. *O.* miſtakes.

6. 'Tis ſuppoſed the Jews lying in wait came to his knowledge, when he was near *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, and that *Timothy* (then ſuppoſed at *Epheſus*) might be involv'd in the danger: but the wait laid for *Paul*, by the Jews was deſigned in *Greece*, and there made known unto *Paul*, which prevented him from going by Sea, and determined his Journey through *Macedonia*. There are but two Reaſons, that I can Imagine, why the Jews laid wait for *Paul*; both which will argue it was in *Greece*, and not at or about *Epheſus*.

1. Becauſe He had in *Greece* of late Zealouſly preach'd the Goſpel.

2. Becauſe He had now a conſiderable quantity of Money to carry thence to *Jeruſalem*. Now if the Jews Plot was laid againſt *Paul* in *Greece*, and *Paul* not

know it there, how came He to know it at or near *Epheſus*? And how could *Timothy* at *Epheſus* be involved in the danger, which threatened the Apoſtle in *Greece*? In ſhort, there are ſo many wild and unaccountable Suppoſitions in this conceit, and ſo contrary to the plain and obvious meaning of the Text, that nothing but a ſtiff and reſolute adherence to a Cauſe, could have brought it into the head of any Man, and engaged others to defend it.

Before I make an end of this, let us take a view of the Ramble, which Mr. *O.* has cut out for *Timothy* this Year. *Timothy* went from *Epheſus*, about *Eaſter*, to *Macedonia*, and ſo to *Corinth*: he came back from *Corinth* to *Epheſus* again, where he arrived by *Whitſontide*: He followed *Paul* ſhortly, after into *Macedonia*, thence ſome way or other was got to *Epheſus* once more. St. *Paul* fetches him back unto *Macedonia* again, carries him with him unto *Corinth*, ſo to *Nicopolis*, back to *Corinth*, thence once more unto *Macedonia*, and ſo to *Miletus*, where he took up his Quarters of Refreſhment, as Mr. *O.* believes: and indeed 'twas high time, after ſuch a Fatigue which he underwent, in about 14 Months, amounting to about 4000. Miles.

Def. p. 132. Mr. *O.* "The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* muſt be written *before*, "becauſe the ſecond Epiſtle was written *in Paul*'s firſt Impriſon-"ment, for which he offers ſeveral Reaſons, which I am now to examine.

1. Mr. *O.* "Argues hence, becauſe *Timothy* was a Young Man, at *Paul*'s writ-"ing the ſecond Epiſtle, the which he proves from the Apoſtle's Exhortation "to him——*Flee Youthful Luſts*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 22.

Anſ. Not to trouble my ſelf, or the Reader, about Mr. *O*'s Calculations, I will admit that *Timothy* was three or four and forty years Old, when *Paul* according to my Hypotheſis, in his ſecond Impriſonment, wrote the ſecond Epiſtle, and adviſed him *to flee Youthful Luſts.* It might not be improper to Caution him, at that Age, againſt Youthful Luſts, ſuch as Young Men are chiefly inclined to. Who is there, that has not known Men of 40. of 50. of 60. Years of Age, overcome with theſe Luſts?

Well! but ſays Mr. *O.* "*Timothy* was alſo *a ſickly man*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 23. and there-"fore 'tis not likely, that *Paul* ſhould warn a ſickly Man above 40. Years Old, "*againſt Youthful Luſts*, 2 Tim. 2. 22.

Anſ. At *Paul*'s writing the firſt Epiſtle, *Timothy* was Valetudinary. True, but at his writing the ſecond, he might be recovered and confirmed in his Health; it does not appear he *was ſtill ſickly.*

Mr. *O.* "For the ſame Reaſon (*ſc.* becauſe he was a Young Man) *Paul* calls "*Timothy Son*, 1 Tim. 2. 18. 2 *Tim.* 2. 1.

Anſ. Mr. *O.* I am perſwaded does not believe himſelf, when he urges this as an Argument, for *Timothy*'s being a Young Man. Was *Oneſimus* a Young Man, when *Paul* called him his *Son*, *Phil.* *v.* 10? Was *Mark* a Young Man, whom St. *Peter* calls his *Son*, 1 *Peter* 5. 13? Were all thoſe Believers Young Men, of whom St. *John* ſpeaks, 3 Epi. 4.? Or were all the Chriſtians at *Corinth* Young Men? And yet *Paul* calls 'em his *Sons*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 14. But, he calls 'em ſo for a quite different Reaſon than is aſſigned by Mr. *O.* viz. *Becauſe in Chriſt Jeſus he had begotten them through the Goſpel*, 1. Cor. 4. 14. And on the ſame account he Challenged *Oneſimus*, for his Son (*v.* 10. *Philem.*) *Whom he had begotten in his Bonds.*

There are Sundry Reaſons, why Men are wont to call others their Sons; which I will not inſiſt on. One among the reſt is, when there is a great difference in Age: Then the Older will call the Younger *Son*, though the Younger has paſt his Juvenile Years.

But in *T. N.* I gave another different Reaſon of *Paul*'s calling *Timothy Son*, which I hope will ſatisfy every Body, but one who will be pleaſed with nothing, but his own Phanſies.

2. Mr. *O.* In his next Reaſon for the Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, being writ in *Paul*'s firſt Impriſonment, many things are affirmed, but nothing proved; "He aſſerts, that that Second Epiſtle was written before thoſe to the *Philippians*, *Coloſſians* and *Philemon*, *Timothy*'s Name being prefixt to them; which therefore ſuppoſes, *Timothy* now got "to *Rome*, according to *Paul*'s Order, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9. *Def.* p. 133.

Anſ. The Proper Anſwer hereunto is, that *Paul*'s Writing unto *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 9. to come to him at *Rome*, agrees every whit as well with Mine as Mr. *O*'s Hypotheſis. The Queſtion then between us, is not to be decided hereby, but by other Circumſtances, which are to be ſpoken of anon. And to cut off all unneceſſary jangle, the ſame I reply to his third Argument, taken from *Mark*'s being with *Paul* in his firſt Bonds: The ſame Circumſtances may agree to the ſame Perſons at different times.

4. Mr. *O.* "Phanſies that *Paul*'s ſufferings mentioned, 2 *Tim.* 3. 11. which "happen'd at *Iconium*, *Lyſtra* and *Antioch*, Twenty Years before the Apoſtle's "Second Impriſonment at *Rome*, imply, that that Second Epiſtle was written "ſooner, than his ſecond Impriſonment: for the Apoſtle would not ('tis likely) "mention Events ſo long ſince paſt, when there were other later Sufferings of "his, that were much freſher in his Memory.

Anſ. Firſt, if there be any force in ſuch kind of weak Reaſonings as theſe, then I ask, ſuppoſing with Mr. *O.* this ſecond Epiſtle written in the Apoſtle's firſt Bonds, why, did he not rather mention his latter Sufferings at *Jeruſalem*, which *Timothy* (being then in *Aſia* according to Mr. *O.*) knew little of, and were the the laſt that had happen'd unto the Apoſtle, except thoſe inconſiderable ones at *Rome*? But the plain account of this Paſſage is, that St. *Paul* is now animating *Timothy* to undergo Afflictions, as became a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt: To this end the Apoſtle lays before him, his own Example, *v.* 10, 11. and inſtances in his own Sufferings at *Iconium*, &c. But 'twas indifferent which of his Sufferings He offered unto *Timothy*'s conſideration; one as well as another, a former as well as a latter would ſet forth *Paul*'s *Faith*, *Long-ſuffering*, *Charity*, *Patience*, and Demonſtrate God's Goodneſs and Protection of ſuch as endure Perſecution for his name's ſake: becauſe God had *delivered* Paul *out of them all*. And might not *Paul* ſay all this unto *Timothy* in his ſecond as well as in his firſt Impriſonment? If Mr. *O.* has no better Arguments than ſuch as theſe, to prove the ſecond Epiſtle written in the Apoſtle's firſt Impriſonment, he had better keep 'em to himſelf: they betray the want of good Evidence, and the weakneſs of his Hypotheſis, rather than Eſtabliſh it.

5. Mr. *O.* advances another Argument, *viz.* "from *Tychicus* being at *Rome* in *Paul*'s firſt Bonds carrying thence the Epiſtles to the *Epheſians* and to the *Coloſſians*: and (ſays Mr. *O.*) that ſecond to *Timothy* *ch.* 4. 12. ſpeaks of *Tychicus*'s Journey to *Epheſus*: therefore *Def.* p. 134.

this ſecond Epiſtle muſt be written about the ſame time, as that to the *Epheſians* was, *ſc.* in his firſt Bonds.

Anſ. But what abſurdity is it to believe, and aſſert that *Tychicus* carry'd thoſe Epiſtles to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*, from *Paul* a Priſoner at *Rome* the firſt time? and then in the Apoſtles ſecond Bonds, afterward to have once more been ſent to *Epheſus*, as is expreſt 2 *Tim.* 4. 12. As if *Tychicus* might not have been with *Paul* at *Rome* in both Impriſonments. Theſe things were noted in *T. N.* but the Miniſter urges 'em afreſh without pretending to reply unto the Solution, I there offered of this ſmall Difficulty.

Here let it be obſerved how Mr. *O.* proves that *Tychicus* went along with *Paul* to *Rome* in his firſt Bonds, *viz.* from *Acts* 20. 4. where he is reckoned among thoſe that accompany'd *Paul* from *Macedonia* into *Aſia*, and then carrying Letters from *Rome* to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*: This is plain beyond Contradiction, *Tychicus* certainly went with *Paul* to *Rome*, at the Apoſtles firſt Impriſonment. Mr. *O.* has demonſtrated it. But is it not every whit as plain that *Timothy* alſo was one of thoſe who accompany'd *Paul* from *Macedonia* into *Aſia*, *Act.* 20. 4. and do we not find that he was with *Paul* at *Rome*, *Philip* 1. 1. *Coloſ.* 1. 1. *Heb.* 13. 23? And does it not then follow according to Mr. *O*'s own Argument (when the Intereſt of his Cauſe is forgot or not concerned) that *Timothy* went with *Paul* to *Rome*, at his firſt Impriſonment? If this be a good proof of *Tychicus* going along with *Paul* to *Rome*, 'tis as good for *Timothy*'s. Thus all Mr. *O*'s petty Arguments and Sophiſms, for *Paul*'s writing the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, in his firſt Bonds are overthrown by himſelf. Great is Truth, and ſometimes breaks forth, and ſhines through the thickeſt Miſts of Prejudice and Prepoſſeſſion. The Conceit then of *Timothy*'s being left behind *Paul* in *Aſia*, invented merely to ſupport a Cauſe (that of *Paul*'s writing the ſecond Epiſtle in his firſt Bonds) is now out of Doors, and henceforth forever to be laid aſide.

Def. p. 134. 6. Mr. *O.* " The ſecond Epiſtle was written in his firſt Bonds, " becauſe it mentions his being delivered from his Confinement, " which he was not delivered from in his ſecond Bonds. In the ſecond Epiſtle 4. " 17. *He was delivered out of the Mouth of the Lion, that all the* Gentiles *might hear* " *the Goſpel*, that is, that he might go about, and Preach the Goſpel to many Nations.

Anſ. Mr. *O.* has unworthily inverted the Order of the Words, and ſo drawn 'em to a wrong ſenſe. Thus the Apoſtle writes—*The Lord ſtood with me, and Strengthen'd me, that by me, the Preaching might be fully known, and that all the* Gentiles *might hear: and I was delivered out of the Mouth of the Lion.* The ſenſe of which Words is plainly this, that *Paul* by ſome Special Aſſiſtance from God, ſo well pleaded his own, and the Cauſe of the Goſpel at the Tribunal of *Caeſar* (where *all the Gentiles*, a great number of the Principal Courtiers, and others being Preſent) heard him, That he eſcaped Condemnation at that time: He was delivered out of the Mouth of the Lion; his deliverance was the Effect of the good management of this Cauſe or vindicating the Truth of the Goſpel, before the *Roman Gentiles.* But as for the *Gentiles in other Nations*, hearing the Goſpel it was not the effect of his Deliverance at this time as Mr. *O.* by miſplacing the parts of the Text would have it underſtood. Beſides, when 'tis ſaid, *I was delivered*, it is not ſaid, *from his Confinement*, as if he had been immediately ſet at Liberty (for then he would not have ſent for *Timothy*) but rather have gone to him according to his Intentions (as is ſuppoſed by Mr. *O.*) But becauſe he

he ſent for *Timothy* after the deliverance here ſpoken of it follows, that he was ſtill a Priſoner, though he had for once eſcaped with Life. Laſtly, if this was his Deliverance from his firſt Impriſonment, then he could not write to *Timothy* to come unto him: becauſe *Timothy* was with him already, * That is before his Enlargement from his firſt Bonds. *Philip.* 1. 1. *Coloſ.* 1. 1. *Heb.* 13. 23. Upon the whole Matter this Paſſage ſhews the Epiſtle was writ not in the Apoſtle's firſt, but ſecond Bonds.

* *As Mr.* O. *has elſewhere ſuppoſed.*

7. Mr. *O*'s next proof taken from *Luke*, is of the ſame Nature with his 5th Argument ſpeaking of *Tychicus*: The ſame Reply therefore, that I made to the 5th will ſerve here, *mutatis mutandis*.

8. Mr. *O.* " Argues from the Apoſtle's Cloak left at *Troas* 2 *Tim.* 4. 13. which " hap'ned (ſays the Miniſter) at his going to *Jeruſalem*, juſt before his being " ſent Priſoner to *Rome*. This Cloak was a *Roman* Habit, which might have " prejudiced the Jews againſt him: therefore he left it at *Troas*: but being ar- " rived at *Rome*, he ſent for his Cloak, his *Roman* Habit.

Anſ. Though ſome believe φαιλόνη here mention'd, was *Paul*'s Cloak, his *Penula*, a Latin word made into Greek, by the Tranſpoſition and Alteration of ſome Letters: Yet 'tis but very uncertain whether they are in the right. For why may not *Penula* be made out of φαιλόνη, as well as φαιλόνη out of *Penula*? Whatever it was, ſuppoſe a *Roman* Habit, which *Paul* had brought with him from *Rome*, after his Enlargement from his firſt Bonds, according to my Hypotheſis, why might he not leave it at *Troas*, at that time that he ſailed thence into *Macedonia*? For ſoon after he wrote his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* (as I contend) wherein he ſhews that his Intentions were to return into thoſe parts once more, 1 *Ep.* 3. 14. which was the Reaſon of his leaving his Cloak there behind him, intending afterwards to call for it, but haply being prevented, and ſo making forward for *Rome*, when there be ſent for his Cloak. This is a fair account of this Paſſage about the Apoſtle's Cloak, without ſtraining it to a Senſe which no body ever thought of before, and which has no Foundation in Scripture. But after all this φαιλόνη here rendered Cloak is a word ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, and never to be met with again, either in Scripture or in the Ancient Claſſical Greek Authors; And therefore its ſignification is very uncertain: it may denote a *Cloak*, and it may denote any thing elſe, an *Hat*, *ex. gr.* or a *Shirt*: it may ſignify ſome ſort of *Writings*, or *Cover* to carry Writings in, and to this laſt, the beſt Criticks incline. *E.* in the *Synopſis Criticorum*, thinks it was a little Cheſt, Box, or portable Cover to carry Books and papers in, grounding himſelf on the *Syriac* Tranſlation; where 'tis rendered *domus Scriptorum*. Dr. *Ham.* gathers from *Phavorinus* that φαιλόνη ſignifies Parchments rolled up, and was the very ſame, which the Apoſtle after calls *the Parchments*, as is imply'd in the μάλιστα— *Bring with thee the Parchments rolled up, and the Books which I left at* Troas, *but eſpecially the former the Parchments*; *fail* not to bring 'em, Others underſtand thereby an Hebrew *Volume* of the Old Teſtament, deriving it from φελλὸς that is the *Liber* or inward Rind of a Tree, on which the Ancients uſed to write, from whence they ſuppoſe φαιλόνη derived. Laſtly, I find φελλὸς in *Heſychius* expounded τὸ τῶν βιβλίων ἔξωθεν σκέπασμα, the outward Cover of Books *. In this uncertainty about the ſignification of this

Heſych. φλοιὸς δένδρου, Cortex Arboris.

* *As alſo* ξύλον ἐλαφρὸν, *a ſmooth Piece of Wood to write on*, Tabula.

Word,

Word, and the variety of Opinions concerning it, how is it poſſible to form any Argument thence? Or of what force can the Reaſoning be, which is grounded on it?

See more of this Word in Suicerus Lexic.

Def. p. 135. 9. Mr. *O.* argues to this purpoſe, " That ſuch as were " more ſeverely dealt with, were wont to be bound with two " Chains, *Act.* 12. 6. But *Paul* 2 *Tim.* 1. 16. was bound but with one; that all " agree *Paul*'s firſt Impriſonment was more favourable than his ſecond: there- " fore he muſt have written this ſecond Epiſtle in his firſt Impriſonment (which " was moſt favourable) becauſe he was then bound but with one Chain, 2 *Tim.* " 1. 16.

Anſ. Whether *Peter* was more ſeverely dealt with than ordinary, cannot be determined, from *Act.* 12. 6. except we had an account of ſome other milder Treatment of him on ſome other Occaſion. Beſides, it may happen that one Chain may be as long, and as heavy as two other Chains. I have known one Rope as long as two other Ropes: and a Priſoner may be as roughly handled, and as ſecurely preſerv'd from eſcaping with one long Chain, as with two ſhort ones. In the Apoſtle's firſt Impriſonment, which was indeed favourable, although St. *Luke* deſcribes his ſufferings in the ſingular, *Act.* 28. 20. even as St. *Paul* himſelf does, *Eph.* 6. 20. Yet elſewhere we have 'em expreſt in the Plural, *Philip.* 1. 7. *Inſomuch as in my Bonds*, v. 13. *my Bonds in Chriſt.* v. 14. *By my Bonds*, v. 16. *To my Bonds.* Coloſ. 4. 18. *My Bonds*, Philem. 10. *My Bonds*, and v. 13. *In the Bonds of the Goſpel.* So that *Paul* in his firſt Impriſonment was ty'd with many Bonds or Chains: as alſo he was in his ſecond (as I reckon it) 2 *Tim.* 2. 9. *For which* (Goſpel) *I ſuffer* μέχρι δεσμῶν *unto Bonds.* The difference then between his firſt and ſecond Impriſonment, was not as to the number of his Bonds and Chains, but other hardſhips which he endured in his latter Impriſonment. If any one will conſider the difference, between his Impriſonment as 'tis deſcribed in the *Acts*; and again, as 'tis very plainly ſet forth by ſeveral Intimations in the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, whereof I ſpoke particularly in the *T. N.* He will be forced to confeſs, that that in the *Acts* was his firſt Impriſonment, and that other referred to, in the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, to have been his latter Impriſonment, and that the ſingularity or plurality of his Bonds mentioned in both, will not decide this Controverſy.

Mr. *O.* " *Demas* was with *Paul* at *Rome*, in his firſt Impriſonment, *Coloſ.* 4. 14. " we read nothing of his being there in his ſecond Impriſonment.

Anſ. There is a manifeſt difference between *Paul*'s Impriſonment, deſcribed in the *Acts*, and in the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, which clearly proves the ſecond Epiſtle written in *Paul*'s latter Impriſonment, *ex. gr.* In the firſt *Demas* was with him, and becauſe there was then little or no Danger, *Demas* ſtuck cloſe to him: but in the latter, when all turned away from him, *Demas* among the reſt (then alſo with the Apoſtle at *Rome*) forſook him in the Extremity. This account is very Natural. Is it not poſſible, Yea probable that *Demas* was with him in both Impriſonments? Beſides 'tis an unſufferable Impertinence to urge ſuch kind of Arguments, as are reconcilable with both ſides of the Queſtion; ſuch is *Demas's* attendance upon *Paul* in his Bonds. But whereas he adds, that *we read nothing of* Demas *being with* Paul *at* Rome *in his ſecond Impriſonment*, 'tis ſo abſurd

ſuch an Obſervation upon his Principles, that nothing could have been ſaid more abſurdly. For on his Suppoſition, that the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, was written in *Paul's* firſt Impriſonment, where ſhould we read in Scripture of *Demas*, being with *Paul* in his ſecond Impriſonment, which on this Hypotheſis is not mentioned any where in Scripture? But becauſe a ſecond Impriſonment is on all hands acknowledg'd, any unprejudiced Perſon will own, that we have the Circumſtances of it plainly enough intimated, in the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, which cannot agree with his firſt Impriſonment, as I noted in *T. N.*

There is a Paſſage, in this ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, which my Adverſary confeſſes ſtands in his way: 'tis this *ch.* 4. 6. *I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought the good fight, I have finiſhed my Courſe, I have kept the Faith. Hencefore there is laid up for me a Crown of Righteouſneſs.* Every Parcel of this Period argues, that the Apoſtle had no hopes or expectation of being ſet at Liberty, and eſcaping the preſent Danger. *I am now ready to be offered*, or ἤδη σπένδομαι, I am now offered *already*, or as good as actually Sacrificed. When a thing in Futurition is expreſt in the preſent Tenſe, it denotes the certainty of the Event. *And the time of my departure is at hand.* ἐφέστηκε, is very near me, and has been a good while hovering over my Head. *I have fought the good Fight*: My work in this World is at an end, and the Fight is over. *I have finiſhed my Courſe*: Nothing more remains for me to do, but to wait the time of my approaching Death. *I have kept the Faith*; I have perſevered ſtedfaſtly in the Truth now to the very laſt. *Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown*, &c. Therefore nothing now remains but comforting my ſelf with the hopes, and Expectations of the Future Reward. Hence we gather that this ſecond Epiſtle was wrote in the Apoſtle's latter Impriſonment, which ended in his Martyrdom.

Mr. *O.* "*Paul* ſpeaks not here of his approaching Martyrdom, but intimates "that being now old and worn with Travels, and hard Labour, and now in "Bonds, he could not laſt long.

Anſ. Paul, it muſt be confeſt, even in his firſt Impriſonment, ſtiles himſelf *the Aged*, *Philem.* v. 9. But let us enquire into his Age. At *Stephen's* Martyrdom, he was a Young Man (I'll ſuppoſe as Mr. *O.* has of *Timothy*) about Twenty Five Years old, *Act.* 7. 58. and this was in the Thirty Fourth Year of Chriſt. In the Sixty Second Year of Chriſt, he was firſt Priſoner at *Rome*. So that at his writing the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, which Mr. *O.* will have to be in his firſt Impriſonment (as that to *Philemon* was) the Apoſtle was but about Fifty Three or Fifty Four Years old. He was but in his *viridi Senectute* in his firſt, and Green old Age. It was not then his extream old Age, which put him in mind of his ſudden diſſolution now at hand, as it were in the courſe of Nature. Neither was it any decay of Health, and Strength occaſioned by his Labours, and the hardſhips which he had met with. We read not that he ever was Sick or Weak, or under any diſorder as to his bodily Health. That he continued vigorous, and healthful after his firſt Impriſonment, muſt be acknowledged, when we remember that after his Releaſe (as is not denied by Mr. *O.* himſelf) he went ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως, *Unto the utmoſt limits of the Weſt*, preaching the Goſpel, which he could never have undertaken, had he been waſted with Pains and Travels. Nor did his Bonds in the firſt Impriſonment, intimate that his Death was then at hand. For he had all along great hopes of enlargement, as

has

has been oft noted out of his Epiſtles. But it was a violent Death he then foreſaw, and that he was to be offered up as a Sacrifice, by the ſhedding of his Blood (ſo *σπένδομαι* denotes), to be made a Martyr or Witneſs of Jeſus Chriſt. Nothing is more plain than this, if we would lay aſide our Prejudices.

Mr. *O.* " Objects, *Philip.* 2. 17. *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι* : and this was certainly in " his firſt Bonds.

Anſ. But who ſees not a vaſt difference? In that to the *Philippians*, he puts the Caſe, *If I be offered*; *I joy and rejoice*, and will undergo it Gladly: this is not an expectation, but a meer ſuppoſition of Death or Martyrdom, as is plain from Verſe 24—*But I truſt in the Lord, that I alſo my ſelf ſhall come ſhortly.* So that *Paul* looked not for Death at this time: as he did at the Writing of the ſecond to *Timothy*.

" Mr. *O.* Objects, Act. 21. 13. *I am ready to die at* Jeruſalem.

Anſ. St. *Paul* did not here fore-ſee or expect to die at *Jeruſalem*: but *ἑτοίμως ἔχω*, I am ready or prepared and reſolved (if it ſo pleaſe God) to lay down my Life for the ſake of Chriſt.

Mr. O. Objects, 1 *Cor.* 4. 9. *ch.* 15. 31. *ſecond Epiſtle* 4. 11. The firſt of theſe Paſſages ſhews only that God had counted the Apoſtles worthy to ſuffer Death for his names ſake, and had appointed them unto it. But as to the time when, or place where 's not ſaid: whether at *Jeruſalem* or at *Rome*, whether in the firſt or in the ſecond Impriſonment, whether when the Apoſtle was Fifty, or Sixty, or Seventy Years Old, cannot hence be gathered. As for *Paul's dying daily*, I ſuppoſe none will allow it as pertinently urged. Laſtly, when the Apoſtle ſays, *we are always delivered unto Death*, he has an Eye in General unto the Hazards they were conſtantly expoſed unto, but not to any particular deſigned time of his own Death. But here in 2 *Tim.* 4. 6. St. *Paul* ſpeaks poſitively in the preſent Tenſe, without any Reſerve or Limitation *ἤδη σπένδομαι*, I am now already as it were offered, which is more than the Conditional phraſe *εἰ σπένδομαι* if I be offered. Again it's one thing to ſay, I am at the point to die, and another, I am prepared for it. It is one thing to be appointed at a diſtance unto Death, as all Men are, or unto Martyrdom as the Apoſtles were, and another to ſay, I am even now ready to be offered. To Conclude Mr. *O's* Reaſoning here is very lame and imperfect.

Mr. *O.* " Adduces thoſe other paſſages following, 2 *Tim.* 4. 17, 18. *I was de-* " *livered, and the Lord ſhall deliver me*, parallel to that, 2 *Cor.* 1. 10.

Anſ. 'Tis true *Paul* was this once delivered out of the Mouth of the Lion: but it does not follow that he ſhall be again delivered: Yes ſays Mr. *O.* it follows—*And the Lord ſhall deliver me.* It is an Elegancy to apply a former word or expreſſion unto a different matter. He had ſaid, *I was delivered* from the Sentence of Death; and then paſſes off quite to another thing, and ſays He——*The Lord ſhall deliver me*, From what? *From every evil work*, from doing any thing in the preſent preſſures, and dangers unworthy of a Chriſtian or Apoſtle and thereby *will preſerve me to his everlaſting Kingdom.*

Def. p. 138. Mr. *O.* " *Paul* did not expect to die very ſuddenly, " becauſe he ſent for *Timothy* to come to him before Winter. " 2 *Tim.* 4. 21.

Anſ.

Anſ. This is truly obſerved and very obvious, and therefore we do not affirm that *Paul* certainly expected to die, *ſo very ſuddenly*, but that he might ſend for *Timothy.* It ſufficeth to ſay, that he expected not to be looſed from theſe Bonds, but by Martyrdom at laſt. That He judged at the writing of this Epiſtle, his Death might be deferred for ſome time, haply till *Timothy* came. Still Death ἐφεστὼς hovered over him, and he plainly ſaw his Enemies, would firſt or laſt by one means or other take away his Life. Nor do we b·lieve that *Paul* was now already under a Sentence of Death; and that for the ſame reaſon, becauſe he had ſent for *Timothy.* We rather affirm that his deliverance, *out of the Mouth of the Lion*, was only his eſcaping the Sentence of Condemnation at that time: That he was remanded unto Priſon, and reſerved for another Trial, when ever it pleaſed the Emperor to appoint it. Or elſe to be Sacrificed unto the Fury of that Bloudy Prince, *Nero*, by a ſudden and Arbitrary or extrajudicial Decree, as I rather believe.

One great Argument with Mr. *O.* is, that St. *Paul* at his Farewel committed unto the *Epheſian* Elders, the Supreme Government of that Church, as the perpetual and unalterable Method of Government, is becauſe, he *knew he ſhould never ſee there Faces more*, Act. 20. 25. Or rather that, *They ſhould never ſee his Face any more.* I offered at a ſmall Criticiſm on the Explication of this Paſſage, but laid no ſtreſs on it. The Miniſter takes a great deal of pains in refelling this: how well let others judge. I am not concerned, nor does my Argument require me to Juſtify that Gloſs. Only it may be worth the while to remember that though *Paul* ſays, *They ſhould not all ſee his Face any more*; Yet *Timothy* did according to Mr. *O*'s own Hypotheſis, and ſo did *Trophimus* the *Epheſian*, who went with him to *Jeruſalem.* Beſides, 'tis hard to believe that St. *Paul* ſhould ſo peremptorily aſſert without exception, that not one of 'em ſhould ſee his Face any more. But as I ſaid, I inſiſt not on this. Mr. *O.* who buſies himſelf in confuting what I made no account of would have better employ'd himſelf, if he had more ſolidly replied to what I laid moſt weight on, that is, that the Apoſtle's ſaying, *I know* was only Conjectural: *Paul* thought ſo; but he was not abſolutely aſſured of it. But

Acts. 20.

Def. p. 139.

" Mr. *O.* is of Opinion that this is ſufficient to his purpoſe, that *Paul though*
" they ſhould ſee his Face no more. That therefore he was not wanting in his
" Duty of ſettling the Government, but gave his final Orders on that Point,
" conſtituting the Elders, the Governours of that Church, becauſe he had no
" hopes of ſeeing them any more.

Anſ. I have had occaſion more than once in this Book to acquaint the Reader, that *Paul* did not now (ſo far as we find in Scripture) commit the Supreme Government unto the *Epheſian* Elders. That the 28. Verſe in the 20*th* of *Acts* reaches not that ſenſe, as is before made out, and ſhall be once more before I conclude this Chapter. Mean while ſuppoſing he had delivered the Supreme Power into their hands, yet the Government might be altered, or perfected afterwards upon occaſion by the ſame Divine Power, which firſt conſtituted it. But after all this,

Mr. *O.* not content with this Argument of his, urges, " That *Paul doth* not uſe
" to expreſs himſelf ſo poſitively—*I know*, when he ſpeaks *Conjecturally.*

H *Anſ.*

Anſ. 1. In all Reaſon the Apoſtle ought to be his own Interpreter. And he tells the *Epheſian* Elders, *Acts* 20. 22. that *he knew not the things that ſhould befall him there*, (at *Jeruſalem.*) How then could *Paul* ſay abſolutely, and without any reſerve or condition, that they ſhould ſee his Face no more? If *Feſtus* had ſent *Paul to Rome* by Land, through *Syria*, and *Aſia*, through *Epheſus*, and *Troas*, as he might, if he had pleaſed, and *Paul* knew not the Contrary, then the *Epheſian* Elders muſt have ſeen his Face once more.

Anſ. 2. I do undertake to produce an Inſtance of *Paul's* ſpeaking as peremptorily or poſitively, as he does here in the 20*th* of *Acts*, and yet Mr. *O.* ſhall and has confeſt it, ſpoken conjecturally or uncertainly, as of a future contingent. I ſend him then to *Philip.* 1. 25. *The Apoſtle had ſaid, that he deſired to be diſſolved: but that to abide in the fleſh was more neceſſary for them*—καὶ τοῦτο πεποιθὼς οἶδα ὅτι μενῶ καὶ συμπαραμενῶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, *And having this confidence I know I ſhall abide and continue with you all.* The Caſe here is this (that I may accommodate my ſelf to the ordinary, and leſs obſervant Reader) *Paul* wrote this Epiſtle from *Rome* in his firſt Impriſonment, he tells the *Philippians* that *he knew he ſhould abide and continue with them*, which implies his return unto the Eaſtern-Churches, and particularly into *Macedonia*, whereof *Philippi* was a principal City: and yet Mr. *O.* all along diſputes, and denies the certainty of *Paul's* going back into the Eaſtern parts, though *Paul* aſſured the *Philippians* with an οἶδα, the ſame word which he uſed when he ſpake thus to the *Epheſian* Elders, *I know that ye ſhall ſee my Face no more.* If then the οἶδα *I know*, is but Conjectural in the Epiſtle to the *Philippians* (as Mr. *O.* muſt grant) why not in the 20*th* of *Acts*? Why then does Mr. *O.* deny *Paul* returned into the Eaſt, after his enlargement out of Priſon, grounding himſelf on *Acts* 20. 25. If he was poſitive in the *Philippians*, and in the *Acts*, Mr. *O.* has loſt one half of his Argument, and beſides is obliged to reconcile *Paul* in the *Acts*, with *Paul* in the Epiſtle to the *Philippians.* But I, who allow both ſpoken conjecturally, that is, with a Poſſibility of failing, am no further concerned than to prove that *de facto*, he went back into the Eaſt, which (I ſuppoſe) is ſufficiently demonſtrated already.

From what has been ſaid in this Chapter, it is manifeſt that Mr. *O.* has in no tolerable degree vindicated the Old Chronology, which fixt upon the 20*th* of the *Acts*, as the time of *Paul's beſeeching* Timothy *to abide at* Epheſus, *when the Apoſtle was going to* Macedonia: neither has he produced any one good Argument, that the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy* was wrote in the Apoſtle's firſt Impriſonment at *Rome.* Once more I obſerve if he had evinced both theſe (as it is alſo noted in *T. N.*) it would not be a ſufficient proof of the Presbyterian Parity. For I once again repeat it, that I did not avoid that older Opinion, which allows the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, to have been written in *Paul's* firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*, conſequently, that the firſt Epiſtle was written before the Apoſtle's taking leave of the *Epheſian* Elders, and by Conſequence, that he beſought *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, when He was going to *Macedonia*, *Acts* 20. 1. I did not, I ſay, lay aſide this old Hypotheſis, as if Epiſcopacy was not defenſible on that ſuppoſition, but rather to bring the Controverſy into as narrow a compaſs as might be. I did therefore in the latter end of the Third Chapter, in *T. N.* ſhew that though *Paul* had before the Congreſs at *Miletus*, conſtituted *Timothy* the Ruler (Biſhop) of *Epheſus*, yet was he not obliged to take notice of *Timothy* in that, his Farewel-Sermon. Becauſe *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, and that o-

 ther

ther to the *Epheſians*, and that Firſt and Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, takes no Notice of the Elders, neither does *John*, *Peter*, or *Jude* in their Epiſtles, nor laſtly, does *Ignatius* in his Epiſtle to the *Romans* make mention of either Biſhop, Presbyter or Deacon: but ſhall we thence conclude, that thoſe Churches had none of thoſe Officers in them? Is it not as reaſonable to believe that *Timothy* the then ſuppoſed Ruler (Biſhop) of *Epheſus*, might be omitted by the Apoſtle in his Farewel-Sermon, as the Presbyters in his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, wherein he profeſſedly Treats of Church-Government, and one would think could not have forgot 'em, when he was diſcourſing on ſuch an Argument. Particularly let it be remembred that *Ignatius* himſelf, whoſe other Epiſtles ſo often, and ſo fully remember Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, in that to the *Romans*, had not one ſyllable of any of 'em; and yet he knew very well that Biſhops (as well as Presbyters) were then eſtabliſhed throughout the World, as he Witneſſes in that to the *Epheſians*. 'Tis then no Proof that *Timothy*, was not even at that time the eſtabliſhed Ruler (Biſhop) of *Epheſus*, becauſe the Apoſtle thought not fit to mention him in his Farewel Sermon. Theſe things Mr. *O.* was pleaſed to paſs by unanſwered; and why, let any one judge. I am ſure they overthrow the beſt Argument the Diſſenters have againſt Biſhop *Timothy*.

Now whether (as Mr. *O.* pleads) *Paul* Acts 20. *Commits the Government of* Epheſus *to the Presbyters only, not by a Prudential or Temporary Conſtitution, but Divine*, by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt, v. 28. enough has been ſaid of this already. Nevertheleſs it may be proper to repeat a little for the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who haply have not read the *T. N.* Def. p. 139.

I do then acknowledge, that the *Epheſian* Elders were made Overſeers of the Church by the Holy Ghoſt, having Power to feed the Flock committed to their Charge. But this is no Argument againſt *Timothy*'s Biſhoprick there, or his Prelatical Power over them. For it is not inconſiſtent to ſay, that *Timothy* was appointed their Ruler (Biſhop); and at the ſame time, that the Presbyters were made Overſeers of the Flock under *Timothy*. We Presbyters of the Church of *England*, do believe our ſelves to be Overſeers of the Flock, and that by Divine Authority too; and yet at the ſame time we acknowledge our Dioceſans to preſide over us, by the ſame Divine Authority. Our Biſhops themſelves declare as much in their Admonition at the Ordering of Prieſts, *viz.* That we are *Meſſengers, Watchmen and Stewards of the Lord, to teach, premoniſh, feed, and provide for the Lord's Family, and to ſeek for Chriſt's Sheep, that are diſperſed abroad.* And at our Ordination, the firſt Queſtion is——*Do ye think in your Hearts, that ye be truly called according to the will of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*? What is all this leſs than that ſpoken to the *Epheſian* Elders——*Over which the Holy Ghoſt has made you Overſeers to feed the Church of God*?

It follows not then from theſe words, that St. *Paul* put into the Presbyters hands the ſole, intire; and ſupreme Government of that Church. They might even then be, and be left ſubject unto Biſhop *Timothy* (for any thing that can be rightly inferred from thence) as we are to our Dioceſan Biſhops. If our Provincial Archbiſhop, ſhould at his Metropolitical Viſitation at the ſame rate, exhort us ordinary Presbyters——*To take heed to our ſelves, and to the Flock over which the Holy Ghoſt has made us Overſeers, to feed the Church of God*, not mentioning our Dioceſan Biſhops at all, ſhall it thence be concluded that Dr. *Stratford* our Reverend Dioceſan is not the Biſhop of *Cheſter*? Theſe things I

think ought not to have been ſhuffled off) by Mr. *O.* as *unworthy*, but perhaps it may be ſaid more truly *above* his Anſwering.

Before I conlude this Chapter, there are two Arguments which the unreaſonable Oppoſition Mr. *O.* has made unto my Hypotheſis, has ſuggeſted to me, proving, I am bold to ſay, *demonſtrating*, that the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, was wrote in St. *Paul*'s Second Impriſonment at *Rome*. I will lay 'em as briefly, and as plainly as I can before the Reader, and ſo make an end.

1. If the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, was written in St. *Paul's* firſt Impriſonment (as Mr. *O.* affirms) it muſt then have been written either *before*, or *at* the ſame time, or *after* the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians* and *Philemon*.

1. Not *before* the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians* and *Philemon* were written, as Mr. *Owen* himſelf acknowledges. *Def.* page 133. For *Paul* at the writing of the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, had ſent *Tychicus* to *Epheſus*, (*Chap.* 4. 12). How then could *Tychicus* be the Bearer of the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, if he was already gone to *Epheſus*, before the writing of that Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*? The ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, therefore could not be written *before* that unto the *Coloſſians*.

2. Not *at the ſame time*, as the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians* and *Philemon* were written. For *Timothy*, who in the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, was ſent for by *Paul* to *Rome* (*Chap.* 4. 9.) was even then with *Paul* at *Rome*, and joined with him in the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians* and *Philemon* (*Chap.* 1. 1.) Therefore the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, could not be written *at the ſame time*, as that to the *Coloſſians* was.

3. Not *after* the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians* was written. For then *Timothy*, who joined in the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, muſt have been gone back into *Aſia* before St *Paul*, which 'tis certain he did not, *Heb.* 13. 23. or elſe he muſt have returned again to *Paul* at *Rome*, and once more gone back into *Aſia* with him. In like manner *Tychicus*, who carry'd the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, from *Paul* and *Timothy*, muſt have returned unto the Apoſtle at *Rome*, and thence been ſent back unto *Epheſus*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 12. And all this during the Apoſtle's firſt Impriſonment, which is not in the leaſt Probable. 'Tis ſuch a Wild-Gooſe-Chaſe, as no rational Man can admit. Therefore, the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, was not written *after* that to the *Coloſſians*. If then it was written neither *before*, nor *at the ſame time*, nor *after* thoſe to the *Coloſſians*, and *Philemon*, it was not written at all during the Apoſtle's firſt Impriſonment, therefore it muſt needs have been written in his Second.

2. The other Argument is grounded upon the Story of *Demas*, as 'tis related in the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and in the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, and that other to *Philemon*, I ſhall repreſent it firſt according to Mr. *O*'s Hypotheſis, and ſecondly according to my own.

2 *Tim.* 4. 10. According to Mr. *O*'s Hypotheſis, *Demas* had forſaken *Paul*, loving this preſent World, and was departed to *Theſſalonica*, before the Apoſtle wrote that ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*. *Paul* in the ſame ſecond Epiſtle, after *Demas* had forſaken him, ſent for *Timothy* from *Aſia* unto *Rome*, (*v.* 9.) *Timothy* being come to *Rome*, joined with *Paul* in the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians* (*Chap.* 1. 1.) and to *Philemon* (*v.* 1.) and yet *Demas* was ſtill with *Paul* at *Rome*, even though he had forſaken *Paul*, and he is by the Apoſtle and *Timothy*, mentioned with Honour in both Epiſtles, *Coloſ.* 4. 14. *Philem.* 24. after he had forſaken the Apoſtle. This is abſurd enough.

For

For here are ſeveral Inconſiſtences, yea, Contradictions in the Story, as 'tis laid by Mr. *O.*

1. *Demas* had forſaken *Paul* (2 *Tim.* 4. 10.) and yet had not forſaken him, *Coloſ.* 4. 14. *Philem.* 24.

2. *Demas* had forſaken *Paul*, and was departed to *Theſſalonica*, and yet was ſtill with *Paul* at *Rome*.

3. *Demas* was at *Theſſalonica* and at *Rome*, at the ſame time.

4. *Demas* at once was an Apoſtate, and yet a Fellow Labourer with *Paul*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. *Philem.* 24. Mr. *O.* may try (if he pleaſe) whether he can ſurmount theſe Difficulties.

But according to my Hypotheſis, *Demas* continued with *Paul* at *Rome*, all his firſt Impriſonment there being little or no danger: at this time *Paul* wrote the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians*, and that to *Philemon*, and therein Commends *Demas*, there being then no reaſon to the Contrary. But in the Apoſtle's ſecond Impriſonment, when the Chriſtian Religion (and the Apoſtle in particular) was more violently perſecuted, then the Apoſtle wrote the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and then *Demas* had deſerted *Paul*, and withdrawn himſelf into *Macedonia*, as indeed *all Men then forſook him*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 16. Let the Reader judge, whether this is not a plain and coherent Account: but Mr. *O*'s confuſed, falſe, and utterly irreconcilable with it ſelf. In a word, here is an end (I ſuppoſe) unto that part of the Controverſy, about the time of *Paul*'s writing the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*. It muſt need be in his ſecond Impriſonment.

And thus Mr. *O*'s main Bulwark, raiſed for the defence of the Old Chronology *ſc.* *Paul*'s writing the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, before his leaving *Miletus*, *Act.* 20. is demoliſhed, and levelled with the Ground.

THE APPENDIX.

I Muſt not deny, as I once before acknowledged, that I borrowed my Hypotheſis, about the time of *Paul*'s beſeeching *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, from Biſhop *P.* and that I believed him, to have been the firſt publick Author of it. I am very ſure he cited none. And that paſſage out of the *Rhemiſts* produced by Mr. *O.* 'tis confeſt, I was not aware of. And what then? They ſtumbled upon, and had a ſuſpicion of ſomething, which they were not able to make out diſtinctly. But the Biſhop of *Cheſter* has done it, with the approbation of the moſt Learned Men, except ſuch as are led aſide with the Biaſs of Intereſt, and have eſpouſed a cauſe which will not allow it. And yet I hope I may ſay without Breach of modeſty, that I did add ſome further proofs and Confirmations of this New Chronology; though they were not abſolutely neceſſary, thoſe of

Biſhop

Biſhop *Pearſon's* being ſufficient without 'em, as I freely own. *Def.* p. 123. Mr. *O.* is not miſtaken when he ſay, *Miracles are grown very common in this laſt Age.* But he has not proved his Propoſition by a proper Argument. He ſhould have alledged thoſe Miracles of this Age, who caſt out the Devil at *Surey*: and that Miracle of this Age, who undertook the Defence of the pretended Exorciſts, and yet acknowledged the Impoſture at the ſame time. It is indeed a ſurprizing Miracle that the Devil ſhould be caſt out, where he never entered: and much more, that two Confident Miniſters ſhould aſſume to themſelves the Glory of Diſpoſſeſſing *Dicky*, when 'tis well know that ſeveral other good Men pray'd for that unhappy Wretch.

Lanc. Lev. reb. by *N. N.*

If Mr. *O*'s diſpleaſed, that I called Biſhop *Pearſon* the Miracle of his time, I cannot help it? but would be glad he would ſhew me his equal from among the Diſſenters. Of all others, I would adviſe him not to inſtance in that *great Man* Mr. *Baxter*, I cannot believe his own Teſtimony of himſelf *&c. That he and his Amanuenſis underſtood Ninteen Languages.* All the World knows Mr. *Baxter*, did not underſtand Latin very well. Haply he underſtood *Engliſh*: and that's all I verily believe he was Maſter off. But this Boaſt of his, puts me in Mind of a certain Biſhop's Chaplain, " Who told his Lord, that they two had " been during the Civil Wars, in all the Priſons in *England*. The Biſhop Mo" deſtly reply'd (being unwilling to load his Enemies with an untruth) I was no" ver in more than one (and there indeed he had been near upon twenty Years) " Ay but (the Chaplain anſwered) I have been in all the reſt. Thus perhaps Mr. *Baxter*, and his *Amanuenſis* underſtood Ninteen Languages: Mr. *Baxter* underſtood *Engliſh*, and his Scribe the remaining Eighteen, and here we have two other Miracles of this Age. A Man of no Learning, making as great a Figure, at leaſt Noiſe, as any other even in this Learned Age: And his *Amanuenſis* who underſtood Eighteen Languages, much more than *Solomon* did, as I believe, or any Man will ever do again. But the greateſt Miracle of all is that Mr. *Baxter* and his Scribe underſtood Ninteen Languages, yet no uſe is made of any of 'em to any purpoſe, except the *Engliſh*, in all the Voluminous works of that *Great Man.*

Def. p. 124, 125. Mr. *O.* informs us, that St. *Paul* had Preached the Goſpel in *Illyricum* at that time, when being at *Corinth* he wrote his Epiſtle to the *Romans.* I will convict him of a great miſtake (to ſay no worſe) by laying the Teſtimony before the Reader—Ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *So that from* Jeruſalem, *and round about unto* Illyricum, *I have fully preached the Goſpel of Chriſt.* Not *in* but *unto Illyricum*, which ſpoils the Miniſters Argument in that place. Concerning *Paul's* Preaching the Goſpel in *Spain* and the Weſtern parts of *Europe*, I chanced to expreſs my ſelf thus——*All the Fathers ſay, that he went to* Spain, *and to the remoteſt parts of the Weſt, &c.* And at this he takes occaſion to reproach me in general for my crude and indigeſted Aſſertions, becauſe I ſaid *All*, &c.

Rom. 15: 19.

Anſ. I muſt needs own that every Father has not affirmed this. But I have this to ſay for my ſelf, that 'tis ordinary to expreſs a Notion thus Univerſally, when nevertheleſs there are many reſtrictions, and exceptions unto the Univerſal Propoſition. I'll furniſh Mr. *O.* with ſome Inſtances out of Scripture, *Rom.* 5. 18.

§. 18. *By the Righteouſneſs of one, the free Gift came upon all Men unto Juſtification of Life.* John 12. 32. *And I, if I be lifted up from the Earth, will draw all Men unto me.* Titus 2. 11. *For the Grace of God that bringeth Salvation, hath appeared unto all Men.* Mr. *O.* I do ſuppoſe in the explanation of theſe, and many other the like Paſſages in Scripture, thinks himſelf oblig'd to qualify them with ſome Limitations. To ſpeak of that only which was laſt named. I aſk Mr. *O.* Whether the Grace of God had then (when *Paul* wrote to *Titus*) appeared to all Men? Yea, had it then appeared to one Thouſandth part of Mankind? Or if he will have *πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις* governed of *σωτήριος*, was it ſaving Grace unto all Men without exception? Or to the greateſt Number of Men? Or only to ſome few? Let Mr. *O.* deal with me, as he is forced to deal with the Holy Scripture, and then an end will ſoon be put unto this ſquabble. I did not then intend to be underſtood ſo ſtrictly, as if not one individual Father had omitted to record that piece of Hiſtory concerning *Paul*: No nor that the Major part of 'em had mentioned it. But that a great many of the beſt reputed among 'em, who had occaſion to ſpeak of this matter have atteſted it. Some Inſtances I will here annex out of the late Learned Biſhop of *Worceſter.* *Orig. Britan.* p. 36, &c. The firſt is that of *Euſebius, that ſome (Apoſtles) paſſed over the Ocean to thoſe which are called the* Britiſh *Iſlands*: And as the Biſhop argues, of all others, *Paul* was moſt likely, ſeeing we read of him alone in Scripture, deſigning to go Weſtward into *Spain.* *Rom.* 15. 28. Theodoret, *That St.* Paul *brought Salvation to the Iſlands that lie in the Ocean,* Having juſt before mentioned *Spain.* *Jerom, That* Paul *having been in* Spain *went from one Ocean to another, imitating the motion of the Sun of Righteouſneſs; of whom 'tis ſaid, His going forth,* &c. And that *Jerom* meant our Weſtern Ocean cannot be doubted: for he elſewhere ſays, *That St.* Paul *after his Impriſonment Preached the Goſpel in the Weſtern Parts.* Clemens Romanus, *That St.* Paul *Preached Righteouſneſs through the whole World, and in ſo doing, went to the utmoſt bounds of the Weſt.* Venantius Fortunatus deſcribes *Paul*'s labours thus.

Tranſit ad Oceanum, vel qua facit inſula Portum
Quaſq; Britannus habet terras, quaſq; ultima Thule.

Hereunto I add, an Authority of my own Collection, 'tis of *Cyril*, who writes thus——*No one doubts but that St.* Peter, *and* Paul *himſelf Preached Jeſus Chriſt unto the Weſtern Parts, which they went unto.* *Cyrill.* l. 2. *ſup. Iſ. Orat.* 1. I ſhall conclude this with the Words of the *Learned* Mr. *Baxter*, who *Learnedly* expreſſeth himſelf thus, in that *Learned* Book of his intitul'd *Methodus Theologiæ*, and in one of the Ninteen Languages, which he, and his Amanuenſis underſtood, *Et revera niſi ſcripta mea & ſeipſa, & me ab accuſatione hac juſtificent; ego me aut illa non poſſum juſtificare.*

I proceed now to Mr. *O*'s Challenging me with making *Paul* to provide the Remedy (of Schiſm) about 14 Years after the Diſeaſe; which he reckons to be abſurd. *Def.* p. 128.

Anſ. I read of a certain Man, Jo. 5. 5. *Which had an Infirmity Thirty Eight Years, and that Jeſus Chriſt knew, that he had been now a long time in that caſe, and yet had never been made whole all that while.* God's time for every thing is the beſt, at leaſt we ought to wait his leaſure, and not preſcribe how ſoon he ſhall heal our Infirmities,

Infirmities, of what kind ſoever they be. But let us examine theſe Fourteen Years, which he Challengeth me with. Dr. *Lightfoot* perhaps computes the time ſo as will reach Fourteen Years: but he's none of my Oracle. I am of Opinion, he has ſcarce ſpoken one true word, in matters relating unto this Controverſy, and this happen'd by the firſt falſe ſtep he made, about the time of *Paul*'s beſeeching *Timothy*, &c. But I can reduce theſe Fourteen Years into Seven, all which time *Paul* had not an opportunity of applying the Remedy; and thus I do it. With Biſhop *Pearſon*, I reckon the *Corinthian* Schiſm to have happen'd in the Year of Chriſt 57. A Year he tarry'd in *Macedonia* and *Achaia*, about two Years I allow for his ſtay at *Jeruſalem*, and Voyage to *Rome*. He remained two Years a Priſoner there, and two Years may be allotted for his Return into the Eaſt, viſiting and ſettling the Government of thoſe Churches; in all about Seven, which at leaſt in the Groſs agree with Biſhop *Pearſon*'s Chronology. But whereas Mr. *O.* makes me ſay, the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was writ *Anno* 69. It is a Palpable Miſtake (to ſay no worſe.) He hereby imputes unto me at leaſt Four or five Years more than I ever reckon'd upon. Well! but how came *Paul* to defer changing the Government, ſo long as Seven or Eight Years? This doubtleſs Mr. *O.* will think ſtrange, and not to be granted.

Anſ. The Reaſon is obvious from the Hiſtory of *Paul*. The *Corinthian* Schiſm broke out: *Paul* endeavour'd to heal it by Argument, and proceeded no further with them at that time. He therefore receives their Contributions, haſtes to *Judea*, is there Impriſoned, ſent to *Rome*, and there held in Durance two Years. After he returns into the Eaſt: by this time the like Schiſm had burſt out at *Epheſus*, and haply in other Churches: and now was the time, and the firſt fair opportunity he had to alter or perfect the Government, and to place *Timothy*, in his ſtead over the Church of *Epheſus*, and others over the reſt.

Def. p. 126. Mr. *O.* "*All this is confidently affirmed after the Rectors uſual way.*

Anſ. It is ſo natural to Mr. *O.* to Challenge me with *Confidence*, that he cannot forbear even when I leaſt deſerve it. I am therefore obliged for once, to ſet the Saddle on the right Horſe: for I'll not reſemble him to blind *Bayard*, as he very rudely doth me.

In that Paragraph, to which Mr. *O.* refers, in the *T. N.* I gave a Summary of *Paul*'s Travels in the Eaſt, after his Enlargement from his firſt Impriſonment at *Rome*: wherein I am far from *confidently affirming*, all his particular movements from place to place, tho' I gueſs at them. I over and over, and yet more than once over again delivered my Opinion with ſo much Precaution, that no Man of the leaſt Modeſty would have Tax'd me with *Confidence* on that ſcore. If any one is at leiſure to inform himſelf in the Truth, let him but turn to the 87th page of *T. N.* and he'll preſently ſee what care I took, and what modeſty I us'd in propoſing my own Thoughts, what frequent Interruptions and Parentheſes I all along inſerted, varying and repeating them meerly, that I might not ſeem too poſitive in ſuch minute Circumſtances. *Ex gr. As may reaſonably be ſuppoſed.* Again, *'tis likely.* And again, *This may be allow'd.* And once more, *very probably.* Then I conclude *Hitherto we have built upon Conjecture.*

Let then any Man of ſenſe Judge, whether Mr. *O.* deſerves not once more to be Corrected with a more than Ordinary ſharpneſs.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Being an Anſwer to Mr. O's 5th Chap.

THIS Chapter is intirely ſpent about *Evangeliſts*. In *T. N.* I ſuppos'd with my Adverſary,

1. That they were an Order of Church Officers diſtinct from Apoſtles, Prophets, Paſtors, or Teachers.

2. That in degree they were next under Prophets, and above Paſtors or Teachers: I added my own Opinion,

3. That they were not only Companions of the Apoſtles, ready to ſerve in the Work of the Goſpel, where-ever & whenſoever they ſhould be ſent upon any ſpecial and Emergent buſineſs: but ſometimes likewiſe fix'd in ſome certain places as Reſident Governours of thoſe Churches, in the Room of the abſent or dying Apoſtles, of which number I reckon'd *Philip*, *Timothy* and *Titus*, to have been.

Mr. *O.* " Becauſe *Titus* was to Ordain Elders in every City, *Def.* p. 143. " and every City muſt have a Biſhop (as Mr. *O.* phanſies) *Titus* " therefore muſt have been the Archbiſhop of *Crete*; and becauſe the Po- " wer of Ordination was lodg'd in him alone, as the Rector contends, it will " follow (ſays he) that Archbiſhops only have power to Ordain, and the Dio- " ceſan Biſhops are excluded.

Anſ. There is no neceſſity that every City muſt needs have a Biſhop. At leaſt in the Infancy of the Church, and whilſt *Titus* alone preſided over it. It was not ſo in *Crete*, nor was there any occaſion for it. Admitting that in the next Age, Chriſtians and Churches multiplying, and all the Apoſtles dead then, haply there might be Biſhops in many Cities, and ſome Perſon conſtituted the Archbiſhop of that Iſland. I ſay admitting this, it will not hence follow, that the Power of Ordination was in him ſolely, and not in the other Biſhops alſo. An Archbiſhop is not of a different ſpecies from a Biſhop, but was appointed, and agreed unto by the Biſhops among themſelves for Peace and Orders ſake; although there might be plauſible Reaſons given out of Scripture it ſelf, for the Inſtitution of Archbiſhops. But that's none of my concernment. This is certain among our ſelves, when a Biſhop is made an Archbiſhop, he receives no new Ordination, conſequently no new Divine Power, more than he had before; that therefore as to the Office of Ordaining and Governing their Dioceſes, a Biſhop and an Archbiſhop are the ſame thing, and that the Archbiſhop cannot ſuperſede the Epiſcopal Power, of his Provincial Biſhops.

" Mr. *O.* will not allow that *Philip* was the fixt, and ſettled Evangeliſt at " *Cæſarea.*

Anſ. Nor am I poſitive it was ſo. I gave my Reaſons for it out of Scripture, ſuch as do I confeſs perſwade me to believe it. But the Miniſter is of another Mind. I cannot help that, nor do I wonder at it. Where almoſt is there a Man to be found, who is willing to renounce his former Sentiments or Errours?

"Mr. *O.* requires it to be proved, that *Philip* was ſettled and reſided at "*Cæſarea*, and that he was no where elſe, *&c.*

Anſ. 'Tis hard Mr. *O.* ſhould require me to prove a Negative; all I can ſay is, I read not of his being *any where-elſe.* After an account given of his Labours in Preaching the Goſpel, whilſt he was yet but a Deacon, for any thing that appears, I find him, as it were ſitting down at *Cæſarea.* Acts 8. 40. He *preached in all the Cities, till he came to Cæſarea,* which words ſeem to Intimate that there he reſted. The next news we hear of him is, that near upon Twenty Years after we find him ſtill at *Cæſarea,*and then ſtiled an Evangeliſt, a Title plainly there diſtinguiſhed from Deacon(*who was* or had been *one of the ſeven* Deacons, but was now it ſeems an *Evangeliſt*): and further 'tis ſaid of him, that at *Cæſarea* he had an Houſe and Family there, and in Condition to entertain *Paul* and his Companions *many days, Acts* 21. 8, 9, 10. I think that here is a tolerable proof that he dwelt, and was the fixt Evangeliſt of *Cæſarea.*

" Mr. *O.* May not an unſettled Officer have a ſettled Family? *Cæſarea* might " be his Birth place, or he might Marry there, becauſe he had four Daughters " there Propheteſſes.

Anſ. Theſe are bare Poſſibilities at moſt, which cannot countervail thoſe Circumſtances and matters of Fact, whereon I build my Conjecture. Herein I appeal to the Reader. Beſides, tho' 'tis poſſible *an unſettled Officer, may have a ſettled Family:* Yet a ſettled Officer, muſt have a ſettled Family (one would think) if he has any at all. *Cæſarea might be his Birth place.* This is poſſible: and it might not be, which is moſt Probable. 'Tis great odds on my ſide. I have all the Cities in *Judea* (to ſay nothing of all the other in the Empire, and elſewhere, where Jews liv'd) to ſet againſt *Cæſarea.* His name would make one think he was an *Helleniſt,* and born ſomewhere among the Greeks. His being choſen a Deacon, in favour of the *Grecians,* argues ſomething this way: as alſo that, at that time his Habitation was at *Jeruſalem*: for why elſe ſhould he be choſen a Deacon there? He removed thence meerly upon occaſion of the Perſecution. After all, imagine he was born at *Cæſarea,* this is no reaſon againſt his being an Evangeliſt there. Once more, *He might Marry there.* True, that's poſſible: but 'tis as poſſible that he Marry'd at *Jeruſalem,* or any other of the Cities, where he had preached the Word. But Mr. *O*'s Reaſon why he might Marry there, is a very pleaſant one, *ſc.* becauſe *he had Daughters there Propheteſſes*; as if he might not have Marry'd in another place, and yet his Daughters live with him at *Cæſarea.* Children are no evidence, where a Man was Marry'd. But what if he was Marryed there? Might he not alſo have been the ſettled Evangeliſt there? His Marrying at *Cæſarea* could be no hindrance, nor is an Argument againſt it. Laſtly, 'tis moſt abſurd to ſuppoſe from *Acts* the 8. 40. That he Marry'd at *Cæſarea.* For 'twas now about 20 Years ſince he arriv'd firſt at *Cæſarea.* There Mr. *O.* thinks he might Marry, and ſo ſettle his Family. I deny it. He muſt in all likelyhood have been Marry'd before he ever came to *Cæſarea*; and that becauſe he had four Daughters Propheteſſes. For if he was there, and then Marry'd, the oldeſt of theſe Propheteſſes muſt have been but Nineteen Years old, and the youngeſt but Sixteen. It is not credible, that at this Age they ſhould be Propheteſſes. Laſtly, the moſt probable conjecture is, that he Marry'd before he was converted, or became a Miniſter of the Word.

"Mr. *O.*

" Mr. *O.* He was an Evangeliſt before he came to *Cæſarea*, which the Miniſter
" confirms by Biſhop *Pearſon*'s Teſtimony.

Anſ. It is no wonder that Bp. *Pearſon* ſhould be of this Opinion, who eſteem'd an Evangeliſt to be, not a diſtinct Species of Officer in the Church, but to denote a bare Preacher of the Goſpel. But Mr. *O.* who believes it otherwiſe, and I who have ſuppoſed it, muſt ſeek for other proofs of *Philip*'s being an Evangeliſt before he ſettled at *Samaria*.

" Mr. *O. Philip* Preached up and down, by virtue of an Extraordinary call,
" *Act.* 8. 6, 7, 26, 39.

Anſ. The places cited prove that *Philip* had extraordinary Gifts, and Abilities, and ſometimes an Extraordinary call unto ſome certain place to Preach the Word. But *Philip* had no extraordinary call unto the office of an Evangeliſt that I can meet with, though he had Extraordinary Gifts in Preaching the Goſpel. For any thing I read *Philip* was yet but a Deacon. 'Tis then reaſonable to believe that he was afterward appointed the Reſident Evangeliſt of *Cæſarea*.

Mr. *O.* obſerves very truly, and I freely acknowledge that I have no Teſtimony at hand, out of the Father's proving *Philip* to have been the fixt Evangeliſt of *Cæſarea*. But whereas the Miniſter pretends *that this* Philip *died at* Hierapolis, *and by conſequence was not the fixt Evangeliſt of* Cæſarea, citing for this *Euſebius*, *E. H.* l. 3. I am forc'd again to expoſe his unfaithful repreſenting Authors, making 'em write what is not to be found in them. The Hiſtorian in *l.* 3. *c.* 31. firſt ſpeaks of *Philip* the Apoſtle—τὸν τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ὃς κεκοίμηται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει, *One of the twelve*, *who died at* Hierapolis. But he affirms it not of *Philip* the Deacon, or Evangeliſt. To the ſame purpoſe *Jerom*——*Philippus Apoſtolus, in Phrygia prædicat Evangelium Domini Jeſu. Sepelitur* Hierapoli *cum filiabus honorifice.* 'Tis true *Euſeb.* at the latter end of that Chapter, ſpeaks alſo of *Philip*, the Evangeliſt and his Daughters (ſays he) ἅμα τῷ πατρὶ τὸν βίον διαλελοιπυιῶν ἐν Καισαρείᾳ, *Who lived with their Father* Philip *in* Cæſarea. But not a Syllable of *Hierapolis.* Nay, here is a tolerable proof that *Euſebius* thought *Philip* lived, and reſided in *Cæſarea.* Here then we have another Inſtance of Mr. *O*'s falſe dealing with Authors.

Def. p. 144.

See L. 5. 24. *l.* 3. 39.

Catal. Script.

" Mr. *O.* ſtill contends that *Timothy* and *Titus*, were not reſi-
" dent (Biſhops) Evangeliſts, the Apoſtle calling 'em both
" away, *Tit.* 3. 12. To the Apoſtle *Titus* came at *Nicopo-*
" *lis*, and after was ſent by *Paul* to *Dalmatia*, 2 *Tim* 4. 20. and we hear no
" further of him. It cannot be made appear that ever he returned more to
" *Crete.*

Def. p. 144.

Anſ. From Scripture it cannot, becauſe the Holy Hiſtory there ends, *ſc.* at *Titus* going into *Dalmatia.* But the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which Mr. *O.* rightly appeals to in the like caſes, tells us, that *Titus* died in *Crete.* What would any Man expect more?

Jerom. Catal. Script.

The Queſtion is, whether *Euſebius* aſſerts the Evangeliſts to have been Reſident, or unfixt Miniſters in *l.* 3. *c.* 37, 38, 39. Mr. *O.* maintains this latter Opinion, *Euſebius* teſtifying——" That they
" Preach'd Chriſt to Infidels, Ordained Paſtors, and paſſed

Def. p. 145.

"into other Countries and Nations: That they went far from their own Houſes, "did the work of Evangeliſts, and diligently Preached Chriſt to ſuch as had not "yet heard the Word of Faith, delivered to them the Scriptures of the Holy "Goſpels, Ordained other Paſtors, and went into other Countries and Nations.

Anſ. True, all this *Euſebius* Witneſſeth: but it proves not Mr. *O's* Point. This many Evangeliſts did for ſome time, but were afterwards fixt in ſome certain place to govern particular Churches, as appears from the Examples, *Euſebius* produces, *ſc. Ignatius*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Polycarp* and *Papias*, all which (he aſſures us) were the conſtant reſiding Biſhops of particular Churches (*Euſeb. l.* 3. *c.* 39.) though they had been ſometime before unfixt Evangeliſts, attending the Apoſtles uncertain Orders, as the neceſſities of Religion occaſionally required. And this is what I inſiſted on in *T. N.* that Evangeliſts were both fixt and unfixt, according as the Apoſtles Ordered them, that therefore fixedneſs, or unfixedneſs is not a proper Note, nor diſtinguiſhing Character of an Evangeliſt; he may be one, or the other, or both at different times, as is manifeſt from *Euſebius.* Though I delivered my ſelf in *T. N.* to this effect, Mr. *O.* takes no notice of it, but urges again the old Argument, avoiding what I obſerved out of *Euſebius*, in proof that his unfixt Evangeliſts, became afterwards the fixt Biſhops of Churches.

It remains then that Evangeliſts, many of 'em were according to *Euſebius*, fixt Miniſters, which is all I am concerned for; and by Conſequence ſo might *Timothy* and *Titus* be.

Def. p. 146. Another Controverſy is moved about St. *Mark*, whether he being an Evangeliſt was the ſettled Governour of the Church of *Alexandria.*

Anſ. I do readily grant, that *Mark* was a great while an unſettled Miniſter, waiting on the Apoſtle *Peter*, and by him diſpatched up and down, upon the Service of the Church, though afterward he went, or was ſent unto *Alexandria*, where he planted a Church, and Govern'd it. After whom *Annianus* undertook the Adminiſtration, and is by *Euſebius* called the firſt Biſhop thereof: which implies, that *Mark* was the Evangeliſt of it, the Adminiſtrator of that Church, having not as yet perhaps received the Title of Biſhop as particularly belonging to him. But

Euſeb. H. E. *l.* 2. *c.* 24. *Ib. l.* 3. *c.* 14.

Mr. *O.* ſhakes me off by objecting——*I may as well make* Peter *a Reſident Apoſtle, becauſe* Euſebius *ſaith, that* Linus *ſucceeded him in the Government of the Church of* Rome.

Anſ. Suppoſing *Peter* was there, ſo long as 'tis reported of him, I muſt profeſs I think he was the Reſident Apoſtle of *Rome*, for there are Men of Learning and Obſervation, who will tell Mr. *O.* that *Peter* was the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*; that Apoſtles were wont to have the ſpecial care and overſight over ſome particular Church or Churches, beſides their general Power, which extended unto all Places. Of *Peter*, *Jerom* teſtifies——*ibiq;* (Romæ) *viginti quinque annos Cathedram Sacerdotalem tenuit* (Petrus): And I hope this Father is of ſome credit, and in eſteem with the Miniſter. They will tell him, that the removing from place to place, and from one City or Country to another, was not of the Eſſence of an Apoſtle: that they might, if they thought fit, remove, or elſe continue and fix. That if an Apoſtle upon ſome Emergent Occaſion ſhifted to another place,

this

this proves not that he was not before his removal, the ſettled Miniſter of the former Church; no more than when a Non-con Miniſter leaves his former Congregation, and running into a remote Country adheres to a new one. Will Mr. *O.* in this caſe deny that he was ever the ſettled Miniſter of the former? They will tell him, that an Apoſtle when he removed, did ſtill hold (even in his Abſence) the Government of the Church which he left, until he thought fit to fix his Succeſſour, or was by Death prevented taking any further care of it. There want not Examples of this kind. Thus 'tis believed, *Euodius* ſucceeded *Peter* at *Antioch*, in the Apoſtles Life time, and *Linus* at *Rome* after his Death. And by the ſame Reaſon it's Probable that *Annianus* ſucceeded *Mark*, tho' not with the ſame Title and Character. But

Mr. *O.* has St. *Chryſoſtom* on his ſide —— τεὶτον εὐαγ- *Def.* p. 148. ϛελιϛὰς οἱ μὴ περιϊόντες πανταχȣ̃, &c. " *Who went not about every where but (only)* " *Preached the Goſpel*, *as* Priſcilla *and* Aquila, &c. " He grants that the Evangeliſts did not go about Preaching πανταχȣ̃ *every* " *where* as the Apoſtles did; but yet they Travell'd up and down *into divers* " *places*, as the Apoſtles appointed them, diſtinguiſhing forſooth, between " *every where*, which belong'd to Apoſtles, *and divers places*, which was proper to " Evangeliſts.

Anſ. I don't find that *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaks one Word here of Evangeliſts, as if they Travell'd into *divers places*, though not πανταχȣ̃ *every where*, as Mr. *O.* Gloſſes upon the paſſage. The Inſtance of *Priſcilla* and *Aquila*, will not evince this. For though we read of ſome removals of theſe two Perſons, yet it was not in Order to Preach the Goſpel, but on ſome other Account. Their firſt movement was from *Rome* to *Corinth*, being by the Emperors Edict Baniſhed thence. This then was not moving up and down *into divers places, by the Apoſtles Direction*, to Preach the Goſpel: but in Obedience to the Civil Magiſtrates, and for their own ſecurity. The other motion was in Company with *Paul* from *Corinth* to *Epheſus*, where *Paul* proceeding in his Journey towards *Jeruſalem*, left *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, *Act.* 18. 19, 21. Whereas then Mr. *O.* ſays, that *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, removed from *Corinth* to *Epheſus*, *doubtleſs by* Paul'*s appointment, as other Evangeliſts did*, I ſee no ſuch thing in the Text. I rather think it was becauſe they were all of the ſame Craft or Trade, *Tent-Makers*, *v.* 3. and as we ſhall ſee anon, not ſuch Evangeliſts as Mr. *O.* and I am now diſputing about.

" Mr. *O.* The Apoſtles went up and down πανταχȣ̃ *every where*, whither the " Spirit Guided them, and at their own pleaſure: but Evangeliſts not eve- " ry where at their own pleaſure, but up and down as the Apoſtles appointed. " And this forſooth, muſt be *Chryſoſtom*'s Meaning, that *Evangeliſts did not go up* " *and down every where as they pleaſed*: but that 'tis imply'd they Travell'd whi- " therſoever the Apoſtles were pleaſed to direct them.

Anſ. There is no Subſtance at all in this ſlight Gloſs. For the Apoſtles themſelves ſtrictly ſpeaking, did not go up and down *at their own pleaſure, every where*, but were under as great reſtraint, and determination as the Evangeliſts were. As the Evangeliſts were under the Conduct and Command of the Apoſtles, ſo were the Apoſtles under the Conduct and Determination of the Spirit, as Mr. *O.* confeſſes. The Apoſtles then travell'd not up and down *at their own pleaſure*, no more than the Evangeliſts did; and the Evangeliſts went up and down

πανταχȣ̃

πανταχοῦ and into as many Cities, and Nations as the Apoſtles did, and perhaps more.

But to paſs over abundance of Trivial Obſervations made by the Miniſter, I will here endeavour to explain, the meaning of this dark Paſſage of St. *Chryſoſtom*, which I ſuſpect Mr. *O.* either does not, or will not underſtand, or has not duly conſidered. *τρίτοι εὐαγγελισαὶ οἱ μὴ περιϊόντες πανταχοῦ ἀλλ' εὐαγγελιζόμενοι μόνον, ὡς Πρίσκιλλα καὶ Ἀκύλας.* In which Words his meaning is (as I conceive) that there were a ſort of Evangeliſts, who went not up and down to Preach the Goſpel *Publickly*, but only taught and inſtructed ſome People that came to them, *privately at home*, and ſuch were *Priſcilla* and *Aquila*, ſo we read of 'em, *Acts* 18. 26. Aquila *and* Priſcilla, *took* Apollos *unto them, and Expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly.* Unto this paſſage, I am apt to believe *Chryſoſtom* alludes. For that μὴ περιϊόντες πανταχοῦ, imports their *not going up and down to preach Publickly*, will be eaſily granted me, I hope: and that εὐαγγελιζόμενοι μόνον, ſignifies private inſtructing, may be inferr'd from μόνον: In which ſenſe 'tis taken, Mat. 18. 15. *Tell him his fault between him, and thee alone* μόνον. Chapter 14. 23. *When he had ſent the Multitude away, he went up into the Mountain apart* (κατ' ἰδίαν privately) *to pray: And when the Evening was come, he was there alone* μόνος; or private by himſelf: ſee *Luke* 9. 18. *He was praying alone* καταμόνας. Thus *Aquila* and *Priſcilla* inſtructed μόνον privately, and alone, not in publick Aſſemblies, or in the Face of the Church; not *every where*, but in private, and at home. If this be the Senſe of St. *Chryſoſtom*, the place nothing belongs to the Controverſy between Mr. *O.* and me. St. *Chryſoſtom* goes on, and having in the fourth and laſt Place named *Paſtors and Teachers*, he puts the Queſtion to himſelf τί οὖν; οἱ ποιμένες καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ἐλάττους; *are Paſtors and Teachers leſs?* καὶ μάλα: *Yes*, he anſwers they are leſs than τῶν περιϊόντων καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένων. *Leſs than thoſe, who travel abroad and preach publickly*, as being inveſted with the Evangelical Office: But not leſs than *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, who were only *private Evangeliſts*. Thus far St. *Chryſoſtom* has informed us of two ſorts of Evangeliſts.

1. The private, who went not up and down to Propagate the Goſpel in Publick, but at home only and privately.

2. Such as did travel up and down, and were publick Evangeliſts. Here there ought to be a full Point. Then he proceeds οἱ καθήμενοι καὶ ἐγκεχειρισμένοι, οἷον Τιμόθεος καὶ Τίτος. The meaning whereof is more fully—*there are Evangeliſts, who reſide, and continue in one place, as* Timothy *and* Titus. He had ſpoken before of private Evangeliſts, *viz.* Such as *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, and of Publick Evangeliſts, who travelled abroad and preached the Goſpel, and now Thirdly, he mentions another ſort of Evangeliſts, who were fixt and reſided in a certain place *as* Timothy, *and* Titus. Which how far it favours Mr. *O's.* Opinion I leave to the Judgment of the Reader. If any one elſe offers me a better explication of this obſcure paſſage in *Chryſoſtom*, I ſhall thankfully embrace it. In the mean time, I believe, it makes nothing for my Adverſary, nor does it in the leaſt diſtreſs me. Yea, it agrees with my notion and *Euſebius*, as I have Expounded him, and I preſume agreeably to his meaning. St. *Chryſoſtom*, Laſtly, mentions a fourth ſort of Evangeliſts, *ſc.* who wrote the Goſpels, but they come not under the preſent Subject.

" Laſtly,

"Laſtly, *Mr. O.* pleads *that* Chryſoſtom, *doth not reckon* *Def.* p. 149.
"Timothy *and* Titus, *among Evangeliſts, but among Paſtors*
"*and Teachers.*

Anſ. How then is *Chryſoſtom* of Mr. *O*'s ſide, as he boaſted before? How will he thence prove that Evangeliſts travelled up and down as *Timothy* and *Titus* did? And what becomes of Mr. *O*'s conſtant affirming, they were Evangeliſts, and extraordinary Officers? But if my Expoſition holds good, as I hope it will, then *Timothy* and *Titus*, are reckon'd among fixt Evangeliſts, and not among Paſtors and Teachers. Beſides, I am not concerned among whom *Chryſoſtom* reckons 'em: they were fixt according to *Chryſoſtom*, and the ſole and the Supreme Power was committed to 'em by *Paul*, as is plain in the Epiſtles. Whatever then their Title was, they were the ſettled Rulers of thoſe Churches.

Finally Mr. *O.* cites *Euſebius* for ſaying, *It was only reported, that* Timothy *was the firſt Biſhop of* Epheſus, *but that there was no certainty, who ſucceeded the Apoſtles in the Government of the Churches,* &c. for which he quotes, *Euſeb. H. E.* l. 3. c. 4.

Anſ. If *Euſebius* had written to this purpoſe, the Words however imply that ſome ſingle Perſons ſucceeded the Apoſtles, though it was not known of a certainty who they were, nor what their Names were. But ſetting aſide this, the Principal thing here to be remark'd, is, that Mr. *O.* according to his uſual Cuſtom, has miſrepreſented *Euſebius.* The Hiſtorians Words are as follows.
"How many, and who of the true Followers (*of the Apoſtles*)
"were reckoned ſufficient to feed the Churches founded by *N. B.*
"them it is not eaſy to ſay, *Thoſe only excepted which any one may*
"*gather out of* Paul's *Epiſtles.* For this (*Paul*) had innumerable Fellow La-
"bourers and (as he calls 'em) Fellow-Soldiers, very many of whom were by
"him thought worthy of immortal Fame, he having in his Epiſtles given an
"everlaſting Teſtimony of them, and *Luke* alſo in the *Acts* reckoning them by
"their Names. Among theſe *Timothy* (ἱστορεῖται) is reported to have receiv'd
"the Epiſcopacy of the *Epheſian* Dioceſs, even as *Titus* alſo of the Churches in *Crete.*

But Mr. *O.* craftily tranſpoſes the Hiſtorians Words. He begins at the latter end——*It was* (ſays he) *only reported that* Timothy *was the firſt Biſhop of* Epheſus. Then he adds, from the beginning of this long Period; *That there was no certainty who ſucceeded the Apoſtles,* &c. As if it were but a Report, and not a certainty, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Biſhops of their reſpective Churches. Whereas *Euſebius* firſt ſays, *'twas uncertain how many, and who* governed the Churches, that vaſt number of Churches planted by the Apoſtles: only he excepts thoſe mentioned by name in the *Acts*, and *Paul*'s Epiſtles, who certainly ruled the Churches planted by the Apoſtles: and among them (ſays he) *'tis reported* ἱστορεῖται: where is this reported? Why in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, 'tis Witneſſed, *that* Timothy *received the Biſhoprick of* Epheſns, *and* Titus *of* Crete. And I hope the Teſtimony drawn from the Hiſtorical part of the Apoſtles Epiſtles, is not an *uncertain Report.*

With the help of that common diſtinction, between *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary* Church-Officers, the Diſſenters ſhuffle off, whatever is brought againſt them out of Scripture. They will tell you that the Apoſtles, and the Evangeliſts were *Extraordinary* Officers, and cannot be drawn into Conſequence, nor made a Preſident for Biſhops, theſe being but *Ordinary* Church-Officers. Mr. *O.* I do

believe,

believe, ſerves himſelf of this ſubterfuge, near an hundred times in this *Defence* of his, and the *Plea*. My deſign then here is to examine this Diſtinction, that this ſhort Chapter may riſe to ſome degree of Proportion with the reſt. The Queſtion then is, *what is an extraordinary-Officer*: And my Anſwer is, 'tis of two kinds.

1. An *Extraordinary* Officer properly ſpeaking is one, whoſe very Office is *Extraordinary* and Temporary. Such were the Dictators among the *Romans*, ſo long as that People preſerv'd their Liberty. Theſe Dictators were Created upon ſome occaſion of extream danger threatning the Common-Wealth, which being over, there was an end of the Officer, and Office both. The Dictator returned back to the Plough, and the Conſuls again reaſſumed the Adminiſtration of the publick Affairs. Of this kind is the High-Steward in *England*, who is conſtituted the chief Manager at the Coronation of the King, or Trial of a Peer. But ſo ſoon as theſe Solemnities are over, there's an end of the High-Steward. He breaks his Staff, the Enſign of his Honour and Office, and becomes a private Man, as he was before. Such I reckon Prophets in the Church to have been, God raiſing them up by an extraordinary Commiſſion for the neceſſary Service of Religion: but it was not neceſſary, that a Prophet ſhould have a Succeſſor, or that the Office of a Prophet ſhould be continued: For in the Jewiſh Church Prophets ceas'd, as well as in the Chriſtian, which every one knows and acknowledges.

2. An *Extraordinary* Officer is one, whoſe Office generally ſpeaking, at leaſt ſeveral parts of his Office are *Ordinary*, neceſſary and of perpetual uſe: But who is endued with many Singular, Perſonal, and *extraordinary* qualifications, and advantages for the Diſcharge of his Office. Such was *Aaron* the High-Prieſt of the Jews. Such were the Seventy taken in by *Moſes*, to bear with him part of the burden of the Government. Such were the Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, the Paſtors and Teachers (many of 'em) in the Apoſtles days as I make account, and am now about to explain.

The *Ordinary* neceſſary, and permanent parts of the Apoſtolical, and Evangeliſtical Offices were Preaching the Word, Adminiſtring the Sacraments, Ordaining Elders and managing the Government, and Diſcipline of the Church. With reſpect hereunto the Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts were *Ordinary* Church Officers; Though having received from God, many *extraordinary* perſonal Gifts enabling them to diſcharge their Office more effectually; on which Account they may be called extraordinary Officers alſo. For ſo we are wont to call even Perſons of very Eminent Natural Parts, and mighty Improvements in knowledge, *extraordinary Men*: Much more then thoſe, who receive their divine Abilities immediately from God. But ſtill for all that, their Office was but *Ordinary*, and it was neceſſary, and God appointed that there ſhould be a Succeſſion unto the Ordinary Apoſtolical, and Evangeliſtical Offices, (though he did not continue the *extraordinary* Gifts. So it appears from thoſe Words of our Lord— *And lo, I am with you alway, to the end of the World.* [Matt. 28. 20. This promiſe of Chriſt cannot be thought to belong to the Apoſtles perſonally; for they were mortal, how then could Jeſus Chriſt *be with them alway, and to the end of the World*? Nor is the Promiſe to be underſtood of *extraordinary* Gifts and Aſſiſtances, ſuch as were given to the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts: For we know that thoſe ceaſed in the Church, in an Age or two. It remains therefore, that in the

the fore-mentioned Paſſage, Chriſt promiſed to be with his Church alway unto the end of the World, in the *Ordinary* work of the Miniſtery, Preaching the Word, Diſcipling Nations, Adminiſtring the Sacrament, exerciſing Diſcipline, and Governing the Church. And from hence it follows, that they in whoſe hands is lodged the Power of Preaching the Word, and Adminiſtring the Sacraments, of Ordaining, and Governing the Church at this day, are Succeſſors unto the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, and inveſted with the ſame Powers, that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts were, though not with ſuch *Extraordinary* Gifts; and by Conſequence are the ſame Species of Church-Officers. *ex. gr.* Was not *Caiaphas*, as truly the High-Prieſt as *Aaron*, and the *Sanhedrim* in the Apoſtles days, the ſame that it was in *Moſes*'s? only excepting the Eminent Gifts, which were beſtowed on the one, and not on the other. I conclude then, that the Apoſtolical and Evangeliſtical Offices, were (if we will ſpeak exactly) *Ordinary*, tho' the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts Abilities were *Extraordinary*. And that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts had, and to this day have, and will, and ought to have unto the end of the World, Succeſſors in all the *Ordinary* parts of their Office.

But it will be Objected, if the Apoſtolical, or Evangeliſtical Office was ſucceeded to, why was the name of the Office altered? The diſcontinuance of the Title ſeems to argue the diſcontinuance of the Office. *Object.* 1.

Anſ. 1. It is held not without Reaſon, that the name *Apoſtle* deſcended at leaſt upon their next, and immediate Succeſſors, which ſome call *Secondary Apoſtles*, the Inferiour Miniſters being indifferently called Biſhops or Presbyters. But in a little time the Apoſtles Succeſſor, laid aſide that Title of *Apoſtle*, out of modeſty contenting themſelves with that of *Biſhop*, and the inferiour Miniſters with that of *Presbyter*. To this purpoſe *Theodoret*, τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκάλουν ποτὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἐπισκόπους· τοὺς δὲ νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκόπους ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον. There is evidence ſufficient in the Scripture of theſe *Secondary* Apoſtles, ſuch perhaps was *James the Juſt*, and *Epaphroditus* the Apoſtle of the *Philippians*. *Titus*, and others are called *Apoſtles*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. Therefore it may be further obſerved, that the Ancient Fathers ſtiled 'em indifferently, both Apoſtles and Biſhops *, as may be ſeen in *Jerom*, *Theodoret* and *Salvian*, as Mr. *B.* informs me. It may not here be paſſed over, that in after Ages, the Learned Writers often called *the Apoſtles* themſelves by the Name of *Biſhop* †, as may be ſeen in *Cyprian* and *Hilary*: and in *Euſebius*, *Peter* is reckoned the Biſhop of *Rome*, in conformity to the Language of their own time, when Biſhop ſignify'd the Supreme Officer of a Church. This Obſervation ſhews clearly that the Apoſtolical, and the Epiſcopal Office is the ſame in reality. But I anſwer,

Burſe. p. 92.

* Καὶ τοι οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἐπίσκοπος ἦν ἀλλ᾽ οἱ ἀπόστολοι μόνον. *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 14. *in* 6. *Act.* *See Quaſt. nov. Teſt.* 14. *apud Aug.*

† *Ep.* 23. *Comment. ad Epheſ.* c. 4. v. 11.

2. That the changing of the Title of the Office cannot import the ceaſing of the Office. *Caeſar* was Emperor by the Title of *Perpetual Dictator*, *Auguſtus* his Succeſſor by that of *Caeſar*: and the following Emperors by thoſe of *Caeſar* and

Spartian. Æl. Verus Cæſ. c. 1.

Auguſtus, (though *Cæſar* at length was appropriated to one as yet only deſigned, and named the Emperor's Succeſſor); whatever were their Titles, they were all *Emperors*. But to come nearer home, and to Inſtance in a Matter more directly to our purpoſe. At the Reformation in *Scotland*, the Prelatical Rulers of the Churches were ſtiled Superintendents; yet the Office of Biſhop was not therefore changed, becauſe the Title was. The Superintendents had the ſame Power to inſpect the Churches in their own Diſtricts, as the Biſhops had. To conclude, the change of the name Apoſtle into Biſhop, is no prejudice againſt the Epiſcopal Power, being the ſame as the Apoſtolical was, and ſucceeding into its place.

Object. 2. It will again be Objected, that ſince Ordinary Presbyters are confeſt on all hands, to ſucceed the Apoſtles in the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments, why not then in the other parts of the Apoſtolical Office, *ſc.* the Ordaining and Governing Power?

Anſ. The Solution of this Difficulty (ſuch as it is) depends upon Matter of Fact, *ſc.* how God was pleaſed by the Apoſtles to determine this Point. This is not the place to diſpute the Queſtion, whether the Apoſtles convey'd their whole Power and Office unto every, or to all Presbyters; it has, I am in hopes, been cleared in the Negative, both in theſe and my former Papers: but to the Objection I reply, that when an Office is attended with Variety of Work, it does not follow of neceſſity, that he who ſucceeds in one part of the Office, muſt be reckoned to ſucceed in all. It cannot be doubted, but the Apoſtles had it in their Power to divide, and put the ſeveral parts of their Office into ſeveral hands: and we have an Inſtance that they did ſo. They made ſeven Deacons unto whom they committed the care of the poor, and diſtribution of the publick Alms, which was before in the Apoſtles themſelves. But then no one will ſay, that becauſe the Apoſtles conferred upon theſe Seven one part of their Office, that therefore they muſt be underſtood to have committed to 'em all the reſt, *ſc.* the Powers of Ordination, of Government, and of Diſcipline. By parity of Reaſon, though Presbyters ſucceeded the Apoſtles, and were by them Ordained unto that part of the Apoſtolical Office, *viz.* Miniſtring in the Word and Sacraments, it will not follow, that they alſo received the whole Apoſtolical Power, that of Ordination, Government, and Diſcipline.

Object. 3. 'Tis further Objected, That the Apoſtolical Power extended it ſelf *every where*, the Evangeliſtical reached to *divers places* and Countries, but it cannot be pretended that the Epiſcopal Power, and Juriſdiction is ſo large, and as it were unlimited. 'Tis rather confined unto a certain Compaſs or Diſtrict, as we plainly ſee; for which reaſon the Biſhops are not the Apoſtles, nor the Evangeliſts Succeſſors.

Anſ. 'Tis no hard matter to get over this ſmall Rub. This unlimited Power of the Apoſtles, may be reckoned among their *Extraordinary*, and perſonal Privileges, and ſo does us no prejudice. The Office may be the ſame, though the extent of Power may be more in one than in another. The Biſhop of *Eugubium*, was as truly a Biſhop, as the Pope of *Rome*. And *Ptolemy* was as really, and to all intents and purpoſes, King of *Ægypt*, as *Alexander* had been of that, and many other vaſt Kingdoms and Provinces: and as he was really a King, ſo he was really *Alexander's* Succeſſor alſo. For who will ſay, that *William Rufus*,

Rufus, was not *Will.* the Conqueror's Succeſſor, becauſe he ſucceeded him not in the Dukedom of *Normandy*, as well as the Kingdom of *England*? We ſee by theſe Examples, that one may have ſeveral Succeſſors, into ſeveral parts of their Juriſdiction. How large ſoever the Dioceſs of the Apoſtles or Evangeliſts was, yet the Biſhops may be their Succeſſors, unto ſome parts of their Juriſdiction. Among the *Romans*, they who inherited any part of the Decedent's Eſtate (were they few, or were they many) were all called *Hæredes*, and diſtinguiſhed according to the Proportion allotted them. Hence we read of *Hæredes ex deunce*, *ex quadrante*, *ex ſemuncia*, *ex ſemiſſe*; as well as *Hæres ex aſſe*, who inherited all.

But what if after all this, every Biſhops Power extends it ſelf through the whole World, being not in its own nature limited and fixt to any one ſingle Diſtrict? Some have thought ſo, and upon good ground too. After many other Reaſons, and Evidences of the Univerſal Power of Biſhops given by Mr. *B.* *p.* 56. It ſeems to me a ſtrong Argument for it, that Biſhops in Synods have ever exerciſed their Power in other Dioceſſes, as well as in their own. I do not ſee by what Authority Biſhops in Councils could take upon 'em, to correct the Miſcarriages of particular Biſhops within their own Dioceſſes, to remove the Heretical, or Schiſmatical, to reſtore the unjuſtly deprived, to confirm the Cuſtoms and Policy of ſingle Churches, except on this one Principle, *That every Biſhop is a Biſhop of the Church Univerſal*, and has an inherent Power over all the World, and *every where*. 'Tis true, it muſt at the ſame time be confeſt, that for Peace and Order's ſake, and to the end the Churches may be certainly taken care of, Biſhops are limited to ſome particular Dioceſs, as to the conſtant and Ordinary Adminiſtration of Church Affairs; and one Biſhop is not ſuffered to interlope in anothers Diſtrict without neceſſity: Nevertheleſs on extraordinary Occaſions, ſuch as Apoſtacy, Hereſy, and Schiſm, the other Biſhops made uſe of their general Power, to rectify Diſorders even in thoſe Churches, where Ordinarily they had no Juriſdiction. Every Biſhop then is a Biſhop *every where*, beſides the conſtant care of ſome particular Church committed unto him.

Object. 4.

But it will laſtly be Objected——That Apoſtles and Evangeliſts were not *fixt*, but *Itinerant* Officers, ſhifting from place to place, as the exigences of the Church and Intereſt of the Goſpel required. This the Biſhops do not pretended to, neither can.

Anſ. 1. Some of the Apoſtles were fixt, or at leaſt fixt themſelves. Thus *James* the Apoſtle (or at leaſt *an* Apoſtle) was the conſtant reſiding Prefect or Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. So was *Simeon* after him. So was *Peter* at *Rome* for 25 Years, according to *Jerom*. So was *John* in *Aſia* for a long time. So was *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, and *Titus* in *Crete*. But

2. Biſhops are no otherwiſe fixt than were the Apoſtles. I have ſhewed before that upon neceſſary occaſions they interpoſed any where. Beſides, a Biſhop may in unconverted Nations paſs from one City and Country to another, and plant Churches, as the Apoſtles did. Thus *Frumentius* played the Apoſtle in *India*, being Ordained Biſhop at *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, by *Athanaſius*. So did *Aidan* in *Northumberland* among the *Angles* and *Mercians*.

Soc. l. 1. c. 19.
Soc. l. 2. c. 23.
Hiſtor. Account of the Biſhop of St. *Aſ. Ch.* 5. 6.

3. It is ſo difficult a matter to define exactly what Reſidence is, and when a Man may be ſaid to be fixt: how oft, how long, and on what Occaſions he may be allowed to be Abſent, and yet at the ſame time be the ſettled Miniſter of a Church, that I think no Man alive can, with any tolerable certainty pronounce a Perſon not to have been the Reſident Ruler, or Biſhop of a Church, becauſe he finds him employ'd in ſome other place upon ſome extraordinary Service of the Church. I make no difficulty to affirm, that when, and as oft as any Emergent neceſſity requires it, and his Superior Commands him; a fixt Reſident Officer may leave his Flock for ſome time, and attend the Buſineſs, which he is thus 'ſpecially called to: and yet ſtill he is their fixt and ſettled Miniſter. If *Paul* called *Timothy* to him at *Rome* from *Epheſus*, and *Titus* from *Crete*, it will not follow they were not the fixt and Reſident Rulers (Biſhops) of thoſe Churches, which the Apoſtle had before committed to 'em; no more than that the *Britiſh* Biſhops, who by Order of the Emperor *Conſtantius* aſſiſted at the Council of *Ariminum*, were not the fixt Reſident Biſhops of the *Britiſh* Churches; Or that the Members of the Aſſembly of Divines, were not the ſettled Rectors, Vicars, or Lecturers, of their reſpective Congregations, though they were a good while abſent from 'em, and ſitting at *Weſtminſter*.

4. One may be the fixt Miniſter of a Church, and yet afterward remove to another place and ſettle there. I ſuppoſe my Neighbour Mr. *B.* had been the fixt Miniſter of ſome Congregation in the Weſt of *England*, before he ſettled here among us. So that if for ſome important Reaſons, *Paul* had quite removed *Timothy* from *Epheſus*, and *Titus* from *Crete*, appointing *Tichycus* in the Room of the former, 2 *Tim.* 4. 12. And *Artemas* to ſucceed the latter, *Tit.* 3. 12. This will not evince, That *Timothy* was never the fixt Ruler (Biſhop) of *Epheſus*, or *Titus* of *Crete*. To draw toward a Concluſion all alterable Circumſtances, ſuch as *Extraordinary* divine Gifts, *different* Titles, *Largeneſs*, or extent of Power over all or very many Cities and Countries, and *unfixedneſs* as to any one City or Province, or whatever elſe of this kind may be alledg'd, make no difference between the Apoſtolical, or Evangeliſtical and the Epiſcopal Power. It is the Ordination which conferrs the Office, and the Power, not the fixedneſs or unfixedneſs of the Ordainer. 'Tis the Power of Ordination given unto Apoſtles, Evangeliſts and Biſhops, which enables 'em to Ordain others, not any alterable Circumſtance, which is obſerved in any of 'em. In a word, that *Ordinary* Officers, may ſucceed *Extraordinary* Officers (underſtand *Extraordinary* in the ſecond ſignification before laid down) muſt needs be confeſt by our Adverſaries themſelves, I mean the Preſbyterians. They affirm, and believe that they ſucceed the Apoſtles in the Office of Miniſtring in the Word and Sacraments of Ordaining, Governing, and exerciſing the Diſcipline of the Church. With what Front then can any of 'em deny, that *Ordinary* Officers (and ſuch at this day are they at the beſt) may ſucceed *Extraordinary* ones, in the exerciſe of an *Ordinary* Office? Or with what Colour can they pretend, that *fixt* Officers (ſuch are they themſelves now, as they believe) cannot ſucceed thoſe who were *unfixt*, that is the Apoſtles? So that theſe Quirks of *Extraordinary*, and *unſettled* Officers are deviſ'd merely to diſguiſe the Truth, and gull the ſimple Part of Mankind into Schiſm and Errour.

The

The APPENDIX.

MR. O. thinks he preſſes very hard upon me, when upon my ſuppoſing Evangeliſts to be a Species of Church-Officers diſtinct from Paſtors, and Teachers, in *Eph.* 4. 11. " I muſt be forc'd to " deny the Dioceſan Biſhops, to be the *Paſtors* of their reſpective Churches, con- " trary to the Prayer in the *Ember-Weeks*. *Def.* p. 142.

Anſ. The Good Man has (I fear wilfully) forgot what I diſcourſed about *Paſtors* in *T. N.* to this effect, that in Scripture *Paſtor* is a common Name given to Superior, and to Inferior Officers in the Church, as Miniſter alſo is. Here in the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, it can mean none but the Ordinary Teachers: *Paſtors and Teachers* by the Figure ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, Importing the Ordinary Preſbyters, for which reaſon *Paſtors* is twice together left out, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29. In after Ages it by degrees came to ſignify Biſhops, at leaſt principally them, and ſo (as I reckon) it is taken in this Senſe, in the *Ember-Weeks* Prayer, *Biſhops and Paſtors*, there ſignifying the ſame Church-Officers. I ſay perhaps: for tho' I will not aſſuredly affirm, that by *Paſtors* in that Collect, is meant the Preſbyters, who aſſiſt at Ordinations, and examine the Candidates for Orders, and lay on hands with the Biſhop; yet the Prayer is capable of that Senſe; *The Biſhops and Paſtors*, that is, *The Biſhops and the Aſſiſting Presbyters*. But

" Mr. *O.* adds, If the Rector ſays, they are both Paſtors and Evangeliſts, he " confounds thoſe Officers, which the Apoſtle diſtinguiſheth.

Anſ. If what I ſaid juſt now be not—a ſufficient Reply hereunto, I add, that one and the ſame Perſon may have diſtinct Offices, and the diſtinct Titles belonging to thoſe Offices. *John* was an Apoſtle and an Evangeliſt. Every Apoſtle was a Prophet, was an Evangeliſt, was a Paſtor and Teacher. πάντα γὰρ εἶχον ἐκεῖνοι. *The Apoſtles had all the Miniſterial Powers.* And ſo had Evangeliſts all the Powers, which their Inferior Officers had: They were Paſtors and Teachers. Nor is this a Confounding the Officers, becauſe the Propoſition is not convertible. Though every Biſhop or Evangeliſt, is a Paſtor alſo and Teacher; yet every Paſtor or Teacher is not an Evangeliſt, or a Biſhop.

St. *Chryſoſt.* in 4 Cap. *ad* Epheſ. Serm. 11.

Mr. *O.* engages me once more to enter the Liſts with him in Philology, a part of knowledge he values himſelf upon, but without reaſon, as will now appear, as it has alſo before. He Corrects me for writing *Mark*'s Succeſſor at *Alexandria*, *Annianus*, which he ſays, ought to be *Anianus*, with a ſingle (*n*) at the beginning. *Def.* p. 146.

Anſ. I have the *Paris* Edition of *Euſebius*, the beſt extant in the World, as all agree. I in my writing *Annianus* conformed my ſelf to that Copy, wherein I find him not once called *Anianus*. And *Valeſius* a Critick of the firſt Form, vindicates himſelf for writing it with a double (*n*) from the Authority of the *Mazarine*, and *Medicean* MSS. unto whom (he adds) *Ruffinus* and *Jerom* Subſcribe †. For

Annotat. in Euſeb. *p.* 37. *col.* 1. *B.*

† *In my* Jerom *'tis* Anianus, *Cat. Script.* Marcus.

Annianus

Annianus is a Latin Word, deduced from *Annius*, as *Valerianus* from *Valerius*; and many other of the ſame Nature are obvious, to any who read the *Roman* Hiſtories. Particularly there was a Poet of good eſteem, in the Reign of *Adrian* the Emperor, named *Titus Annianus*, as I obſerved in *Helvicus*'s Chronology accidentally, when I was looking for another thing. 'Tis true, other *MSS.* write him *Anianus*, as Mr. *O.* does, and *Euſebius* has *Annianus*. But what then? When a Word is differently written, may not one chuſe to write it, as he pleaſes? Haply, if I had chanced to have followed thoſe, who believe the right name to be *Anianus*, Mr. *O.* could have amended it into *Annianus*. But I do him too much credit, by ſuppoſing he knew any thing of this different way of writing *Annianus*.

I alſo read in *Socrates* & *Soz.* of one *Annianus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, and of another (if another) who ſubſcrib'd the *Sardic* Council. *Athanaſ.* Apol. 2. *contra Arian.* p. 767.

Def. p. 148. "Mr. *O.* hopes the Rector will not make a ſettled Church "Officer, a Biſhop, of *Priſcilla* a Woman. This I ſuppoſe he intends for a little piece of Wit, or a Jeer.

Anſ. Why not a *Biſhop* as well as an *Evangeliſt*? And why not a *ſettled* Church-Officer, as well or rather than an *Itinerant* one? I am ſure a modeſt and virtuous Woman, is not very forward to gad abroad: 'tis her Character that ſhe Loves home, and not often appears in publick. St. *Chryſoſtom* makes her an *Evangeliſt*. Let Mr. *O.* look how well that ſuits with his profeſſed Opinion of *Evangeliſts* being *Extraordinary unfixt* Officers. Let Mr. *O.* acquit St. *Chryſoſtom*, and his own dear ſelf in the firſt place, and the Rector will be ſafe I am confident. But ſurely Mr. *O.* knows an Ancient Father (of good credit with him, tho' with no body elſe) I mean *Dorotheus* — who among other of his Fables makes *Priſcilla* a *Biſhop*. If his Authority be ſo good, Mr. *O.* has the Myſtery proved to him.

Def. p. 150. Mr. *O.* *It is well obſerved by the late Learned Biſhop of* Worceſter, *that the firſt that called* Timothy *Biſhop of* Epheſus, *was* Leontius *Biſhop of* Magneſia *in the Council of* Chalcedon, *Four Hundred Years after.*

Anſ. By the Miniſters good leave, I muſt Queſtion the Truth of what he here aſſerts, though he backs it with never ſo good Authority. Whoever ſhall tell me that, *The firſt, who called* Timothy *Biſhop of* Epheſus, *was* Leontius *Biſhop of* Magneſia, *in the Council of* Chalcedon, muſt excuſe me if I ſay, he is groſly miſtaken. *Euſebius*, who lived, and Flouriſhed above an Hundred Years before that Council, ſays, that ἱστορεῖται (which muſt at leaſt be underſtood of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory before *Euſebius*'s Time) Τιμόθεος γε μὴν τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας πρῶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι. *It is recorded in Hiſtory, That* Timothy *firſt received the Epiſcopacy of the Dioceſs of* Epheſus. *Jerom* calls him Biſhop of *Epheſus*; and he was 60 Years before the ſaid Council of *Chalcedon* *. Thus much I have adventured to ſay, before I

Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. c. 4.

Catal. ſcr. Eccleſ.

* We find him acknowledged Biſhop of *Epheſus*, in the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, by *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 15. in 1 *Tim.* and by *Theodoret* Argument. in 1 *Tim.* and in his Comment. 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. all before the Council of *Chalcedon*.

conſult

conſult Mr. *O*'s Teſtimony, borrowed from the *Irenicum*. But I am now go-
ing to conſult the Learned Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and examine whether he was guil-
ty of this Overſight, imputed to him by the Miniſter——Well! I have de-
liberately, as well as I can, read the 302*d* and 303*d* pages of the *Irenicum*,
and I find Mr. *O.* has ſerved that Reverend Author, as he has done many a
good one beſides, in downright Terms belying him. Mr. *Stillingfleet* (ſo I
will make bold to call him, that Book being wrote in his Youth, and before he
had received the Honours which were afterward deſervedly beſtowed on him)
ſpeaking there of the Succeſſion of Biſhops, tells us, "That the Succeſſion at
" *Epheſus* is pleaded for with greateſt Confidence by *Leontius* Biſhop of *Magneſia*,
" in the Council of *Chalcedon*. Mr. *Stillingfleet* ('tis confeſt) afterward has theſe
Words——*No wonder then if* Leontius *makes* Timothy *Biſhop of* Epheſus, *and
derives the Succeſſion down from him*. He does not affirm, that *Leontius firſt cal-
led* Timothy *Biſhop of* Epheſus. But that *'tis no wonder, if he made* Timothy *Bi-
ſhop of* Epheſus, and thence proved the Succeſſion of Biſhops, by the Succeſſion
of the *Epheſian* Biſhops, down from *Timothy*. He made *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, but
he was not *the firſt* that did ſo: for many had done it before him. I will not de-
ny, perhaps this Learned Author at that time Queſtioned, whether *Timothy* was
ſo or no. However he did not aſſert, that *Leontius* was *the firſt* that called him
Biſhop of *Epheſus*. Mr. *O.* then, who ſeems to value himſelf,
for the Hundreds of his quotations would do well, if he more *Def.* p. 147.
carefully examined his Authors, and more ſincerely repreſented
their Opinions. But 'tis no hard matter for any one (if he will make it his buſi-
neſs for ſome little time) to Collect an innumerable number of Authorities
upon this Subject of Epiſcopacy. 'Tis but taking into his hand, *Blondel* and
Salmaſius, *Forbes* and *Stillingfleet*, *Saravia* and ſome others, particularly Mr.
Baxter (from whom Mr. *O.* has borrowed at leaſt two of his Arguments in his
Plea, almoſt *verbatim*, and many of the Teſtimonies, wherewith he has confirm-
ed 'em) and he ſhall be thought by Ignorant Readers *Helluo Librorum*, a De-
vourer of Books, a Man of infinite Reading, and intimate acquaintance with
the Fathers, and Ancient Writers, when perhaps he never read one of 'em, no
nor ſo much as conſulted the particular Teſtimonies, which he cites out of 'em.
But 'tis one thing to dabble in Authors, and another throughly to underſtand,
and truly to repreſent 'em.

CHAP. VI.

Being an Anſwer to Mr. O's 6th Chap.

THE Principal Matter whereof may be reduced unto Four Heads.

1. What has already been argued between us in the former Chapters, which I quite lay aſide.

2. What will fall in my way, when I Reply farther unto the *Plea*, which I reſerve to a more convenient Place, the ſecond part of this Book.

3. What is here *de novo* ſtarted againſt the Rector, which I make the Subject of this laſt Chapter. And,

4. The Cavils, wherewith he has furniſhed out this laſt part of his *Defence*, which are conſidered apart in the Appendix.

In Vindicating the *Pollitie* of the Church of *England*, I aſſerted in *T. N.* That the Pariſh Prieſts have a ſhare of Power in the Eccleſiaſtical Government; for as much as all the Canons, or Laws of the Church are made by them, with their knowledge and conſent in Convocation.

Def. p. 151. Mr. *O. The Acts of Convocation are no Laws, till they be confirmed in Parliament.*

Anſ. They are, though not Civil, yet Eccleſiaſtical Laws, and formerly at eaſt obliged in Conſcience, as the late Biſhop of *Worceſter* informs me, Eccleſiaſtical Caſes *p.* 336. 372, 373. 'Tis nothing to me, whether in Convocation they be made Laws of the Land; I was ſpeaking of the Laws of the Church. Beſides, Mr. *O*'s Charge againſt us was, that all the Power in the Church is in the Biſhop's Hands. But this Argument of his Excludes not only the Preſbyters, but the Biſhops alſo from having any Power in the Eccleſiaſtical Legiſlative. For 'tis likewiſe true that the Decrees of Convocation, tho' they were made by the Biſhops *only*, as Mr. *O.* would inſinuate, yet would not be Laws of the Land till confirmed by Parliament. Thus the Miniſter by denying or queſtioning too much has deſtroyed the Subject of the Queſtion, the Biſhops alſo being hereby ſtrip'd of their Power, as well as the Preſbyters. 'Tis then to no purpoſe for us to diſpute whether the Biſhops have all the Eccleſiaſtical Power in their hands, or whether the Preſbyters have ſome, ſince according to Mr. *O.* neither of 'em have any.

Def. p. 152. Mr. *O. Has every Pariſh Prieſt a Power of making Church Laws? If not*, &c. "He thinks—they have not, and argues, That if "the Pariſh Prieſts make Laws by their Repreſentatives, and ſhall therefore be "thought to have Power of Diſcipline, it will follow, that Free-holders have "Power of Government, their Repreſentatives in Parliament, being concerned "in the making Laws.

Anſ. The Rector aſſerts not that *Every Pariſh Prieſt has a Power of making Church Laws.* It were an unreaſonable thing. But every Pariſh Prieſt has a ſhare in the Power of making Eccleſiaſtical Laws, which he executes by his Repreſentative in Convocation: and I add, *Every Free-holder has a ſhare of Power*

in

in making the Political-Laws. But all this is Trifling. Nothing is more evident than this, what is done by a Repreſentative is the Act and Deed of the Perſons repreſented. And nothing is more Ordinary, than to tell diſcontented People, when the Laws are executed upon them, that *they are of their own making*, that is made by their Repreſentatives.

Mr. *O. The Convocation is not a juſt Repreſentative of the Clergy.*

Anſ. There are two things only (that I know of) neceſſary to make a juſt Repreſentative.

1. That the Repreſenters be ſufficient as to Number.

2. That they be freely choſen by the Repreſented. On both accounts I will prove that the Convocation is a juſt Repreſentative of the Clergy.

1. One cannot from the reaſon of the thing gather with any certainty, what number of Repreſentors is neceſſary to make *a juſt* Repreſentative, and 'twould be in vain to alledge the private Sentiments of Men, among whom it will haply be found *quot homines tot ſententiæ*, ſo many Men, ſo many Minds. The ſureſt way then to determine this Point is (I think) to compare the Convocation with the Houſe of Commons, which is the Repreſentative of People. My Argument lies thus——" If the Houſe of Commons be a juſt Repreſentative of the " People, as to the number of the Repreſenters, which no Body, I preſume, " will dare to deny, then the Convocation is a juſt Repreſentative of the Clergy. Let us then compare the number of the *Repreſenters* and the *Repreſented* in the Houſe of Commons with the number of the *Repreſenters*, and *Repreſented* in the Houſe of Convocation.

The People of *England* repreſented in Parliament, are according to Dr. *Chamberlain's* computation in *Notitia Angliæ*, between five and ſix Millions: Their Repreſenters in the Houſe of Commons about five hundred. The Clergy of *England*, are, I reckon, about fifteen Thouſand (allowing ten Thouſand for the Parſons, Rectors, and Vicars of ſo many Pariſhes, and adding to theſe the Maſters and Fellows of the Colledges in both Univerſities, Chaplains, Lecturers, and Curates, which will in all amount to five Thouſand more) as I will grant, becauſe I will not favour a ſide; tho' it may be they'll not reach above one Third part of that Number. The Repreſenters of theſe fifteen Thouſand in Convocation, are an hundred Sixty and Six, which make up the two lower Houſes of Convocation in both Provinces. Any Man may hence diſcern at firſt ſight, the diſproportion between five hundred Members of the Houſe of Commons, Repreſenting above five Millions of People. And one Hundred Sixty and Six Members of Convocation repreſenting only fifteen Thouſand Clergy. Every Parliament Man (let us now conſider them *diviſim*) repreſents about ten Thouſand Perſons: But every Member of Convocation repreſents not much above Ninety. The difference then is as Ninety to ten Thouſand. If then the Members of the Houſe of Commons are in reſpect of number, a juſt Repreſentative of the People (as we all believe) much more are the Members of Convocation, a juſt Repreſentative of the Clergy.

Now becauſe the Wiſdom and Integrity of Repreſenters is to be regarded alſo, as well as their Number, and becauſe their Wiſdom and Integrity, cannot be better judged of, than by conſidering the freedom of their choice, we are in the next place to enquire whether the Members of Convocation are not as freely choſen by the Clergy, as the Members of Parliament are by the People.

Let it then be remembred that a great part of the Nation, have not any Voice at all in the Election of Members of Parliament: For (we know) a vaſt number of Servants, Labourers, Mechanicks, Shop-keepers, Merchants, Artiſts of all ſorts. Scholars, Attorneys, Lawyers, Phyſicians, Divines (not having Freehold Eſtates), Copy-holders, Minors alſo, and ſingle Women have no Voice in the Election of any Parliament Man: That is (as I reckon) four parts of five of the People are not at all admitted to chuſe Parliament Men. But all the Parſons, Rectors and Vicars, have Suffrages in the Election of Members of Convocation, and theſe Electors are two Thirds of the Clergy, *viz.* Parſons, Rectors and Vicars, being ten Thouſand by my former Calculation. It appears hence, that if the Houſe of Commons is a juſt Repreſentative of the People with reſpect to their Election, much more is the Convocation a juſt Repreſentative of the Clergy: four fifths of the People, as I reckon, being intirely excluded from chooſing Members of Parliament, and but one Third part of the Clergy from chooſing Members of Convocation.

But to evince this, and make it yet more plain, we muſt go another way to work, becauſe of the various methods, whereby Perſons by Ancient Cuſtom, or Conſtitution become Members of Parliament, and of Convocation without any due Election.

Of the five hundred Members of the Houſe of Commons, one hundred are *Knights*, choſen only by Free-holders, who are not haply an eighth part of the People of *England*; and the other four hundred are *Citizens*, *Burgeſſes and Barons of the Cinque Ports*, Elected by an handful of Men, who are not (I believe) a fiftyeth part of the People of *England*. And theſe latter, in reſpect of the Body of the Nation, I can ſcarce admit to be *elected*; they may more fitly be ſaid to come in by Privilege. Of the one hundred Sixty and Six Members of Convocation, about fifty two, or a third part are choſen Proctors, by the Parſons, Vicars and Rectors, who are two thirds of the Clergy; about an hundred and fourteen, come in by vertue of their Dignities (as Deans and Arch-Deacons) or by the Election of the Chapters only. Let any one then judge whether the lower Houſes of Convocation, are near ſo much cramp'd with Members by Privilege, as the Houſe of Commons is: four parts of the Houſe of Commons, being choſen by not a fiftieth part of the Pople, and the fifth part of'em, by about an eighth part of the People; But a third part of the Convocation is choſen by two thirds of the Clergy, and the reſt by privilege. If then the Houſe of Commons, notwithſtanding what has been obſerved, are by all Wiſe Men look'd upon as a juſt Repreſentative of the People, with reſpect unto their choice, as well as their number, I would know a Reaſon, why the Convocation is not a juſt Repreſentative of the Clergy.

Now leaſt what has been ſaid ſhall not be thought clear enough, and ſufficient to evince what it is intended for, there being a great uncertainty in ſuch Calculations, I ſhall compare the Convocation with the Aſſembly of Divines at *Weſtminſter*, who (if I am not much miſtaken) will be found on both the forementioned Accounts, that is of Number, and of Choice to have been not ſo juſt a Repreſentative of the Clergy, as the Convocation is. This will be diſpatched in a very few Words.

In the Year 1643. the Parliament called that *Aſſembly*, conſiſting of one hundred twenty and two Perſons: Of whom let it be noted,

1. That

1. That they fell ſhort of the two Houſes of Convocation, forty four in number, beſides, that there were ſome *Scots* among 'em.

2. That not one of 'em was choſen by the Clergy, but all Nominated by the Parliament. Either then let Mr. *O.* give over taxing the Convocation, as if it were not a *juſt Repreſentative* of the Clergy, or confeſs the *Weſtminſter Aſſembly*, to have been packed to ſerve a Turn, contrary to all Law and Juſtice. In ſhort, and to retort Mr. *O's* Reflections, the Aſſemby of Divines, were all of 'em (except a few Nominated for a Colour) the Parliaments *Creatures, choſen by them alone.* The reſt, if they had joined in the *Weſtminſter* Deliberations, had been *meer Cyphers*: there were *enough to out-vote 'em*, beſides, thoſe Lords and Commoners, who were taken into the Aſſembly, like ſo many Lay-Elders to *Influence* their Counſels, and prevent any Decree that might be offered contrary to that Parliaments Inclinations or Deſigns.

Mr. *O.* "If the Rector can find no proof in Scripture, that "Ordinary Preſbyters did ſuſpend at all, how dare they "(the Epiſcopal-Clergy) do it for a Fortnight? If Preſbyters may by Scripture "ſuſpend, how dares the Rector condemn the Diſſenting Miniſters for ſu-"ſpending? *Def.* p. 153.

Anſ. We ſuſpend not by virtue of our own ſole inherent Power, but in conjunction with our Dioceſan, with his knowledge and conſent. There is a great Difference between an Inherent Power for Preſbyters to ſuſpend (a precedent for which I require out of Scripture) and to ſuſpend for a time, according to the Conſtitutions of the Church, and in Subordination to the Biſhop, unto whom the Party Suſpended may appeal.

Mr. *O.* Whereas I affirmed, that the Ordinary Elders had not Supreme Authority in the Churches, at leaſt not after *Paul's* return from *Italy* in the Eaſt, the Miniſter inferrs, that, *herein is imply'd, that Ordinary Preſbyters had the Supreme Authority before that time, and Challenges the Rector to prove they were ever deprived of it afterward.* *Def.* p. 156.

Anſ. There is no ſuch thing imply'd by the Rector, but only ſuppoſed at moſt, to avoid all unneceſſary Diſputes with his Adverſaries. But if it were out of queſtion, that the Ordinary Elders had once the Supreme Authority, yet the Apoſtle committing afterward the Supreme Authority, unto ſingle Perſons, *ex. gr.* unto *Timothy* and *Titus*, and making no mention at all of the Ordinary Preſbyters, muſt be underſtood to ſuperſede the Power, that was before in the Preſbyters, and to ſubject them unto thoſe ſingle Perſons for the future. But this is the Point in Controverſy throughout theſe Papers, and needs not here to be inſiſted on.

Mr. *O. Here the Rector fairly confeſſes there were no Biſhops, when the Epiſtle to the* Epheſians *was written in* Paul's *firſt Bonds.* *Def.* p. 157.

Anſ. The Rector ſuppoſes it only, as is ſaid before, but does not grant it. Nay, he is quite of another mind. But it ſufficeth to his Hypotheſis, that ſingle Perſons were (afterward at leaſt) Conſtituted Rulers (Biſhops) in the Churches.

Mr. *O.* "*Timothy* could not receive the ſole Power of Ordination, becauſe "*Paul* took in the Preſbyters, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.

Anſ. Here Mr. *O.* (if I take him right) grants that *Timothy* was Ordained by *Paul*, taking the Presbyters into his Aſſiſtance. This is as much, as I deſire, and the exact Pattern of our Ordinations. Presbyters therefore did not by their own ſole Power Ordain, but in Conjunction with the Apoſtle. On the other hand, if the *Revelation* concerning *Timothy*'s Ordination, came to the Presbyters, as well as to St. *Paul*, they then acted not as *Ordinary* Presbyters, but as *Prophets*, and ſo cannot warrant Ordinary Presbyters, Ordaining by Virtue of their Ordinary Power. Laſtly, it no where appears that *Paul* joined the Presbyters in Commiſſion with *Timothy*, it may then be reaſonable to conclude, that *Timothy* received the *ſole* Power, though 'tis ſufficient for me to ſay, He had the *Supreme*.

Mr. *O.* "But *Paul* joined *Barnabas* with him in the Ordinations, *Acts.* 14. 23.

Anſ. Be it ſo: yet ſtill if *Barnabas* was an Apoſtle as well as *Paul* (as is manifeſt from *Acts* 14. 4, 14. *Gal.* 29.) And if *Barnabas* was equal to *Paul*, as many believe, and Mr. *O.* will not deny, then we are but where we were before. This is nothing to Ordinary Elders Ordaining. That *Barnabas* was tho' not equal to *Paul*, yet independent on him, may be probably hence gathered that in the ſharp Conteſt between 'em, *Barnabas* ſubmitted not to *Paul* but ſeparated from him, *Acts* 15. 39. Beſides, *Barnabas* received the ſame Commiſſion that St. *Paul* did, and at the ſame time, *Acts* 13. 1, 2. However, admitting *Barnabas* was but a Secondary Apoſtle, which I rather believe, or Evangeliſt, yet Mr. *O.* will not (I hope) deny he was more than an Ordinary Elder, what then is this to Ordinary Elders Ordaining, by their own ſole Power, and inherent Authority? And how will it hence follow, that becauſe *Paul* admitted *Barnabas*, an Apoſtle, at leaſt a Secondary Apoſtle, to join in the Ordinations, (*Acts* 14. 23.) that therefore *Timothy* joined the Ordinary Presbyters with him? All this notwithſtanding, I give Mr. *O.* what he cannot prove, *ſc.* That *Timothy* did not Ordain alone. 'Tis enough to my purpoſe, that he was conſtitued the Principal Judge and Director in Ordinations, as in all other *Acts* of Juriſdiction.

Def. p. 162. Mr. *O.* The Rector having argued from *προσμεῖναι*, that *Timothy*, was intended the Reſident Governour of the Church of *Epheſus*, the Miniſter denies it, upon the Authority of *Mat.* 15. 32. *Mark.* 8. 2.

Anſ. *προσμένουσιν* in theſe places produced againſt me is Limited by *τρεῖς ἡμέρας* which makes a great difference. A Man may be ſaid *προσμένειν*, to reſide or abide in a place one, two or three Days, or Months, or Years, and yet we know what 'tis to reſide, when 'tis ſpoken undeterminately. As for thoſe Words——*Till I come*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 13. 'tis no Limitation of *Timothy*'s Reſidence at *Epheſus*, nor does it imply, that his Authority there muſt then ceaſe. If it were ſo, then after *Paul* was come to *Epheſus*, *Timothy* muſt have left off, *Giving attendance unto Reading, to Exhortation, to Doctrine*, which yet I ſuppoſe were Duties perpetually incumbent upon him, let the Apoſtle be at *Epheſus* or not. In a word, St. *Paul*'s going *ſhortly* to *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, was not with intent to remove him thence, but to Inſtruct him throughly, how to behave himſelf in the Houſe of God, the Church committed to his Charge, as is before obſerved and proved. Neverthel eſs, leaſt the Apoſtle ſhould be prevented of his intended Viſit,

Viſit, and ſhould carry long (as he ſuſpected might happen) he ſent him for the preſent this Epiſtle containing the ſum of what afterward, when he came to *Epheſus*, he would more at large communicate unto him. But theſe are Repetitions.

Mr. *O.* to prove that *Timothy* had been furniſhed with the ſame Powers at *Corinth, Philippi* and *Theſſalonica*, as he was afterwards at *Epheſus*, " Alledges the Rectors granting that unfixt Evangeliſts " governed the Churches, and Ordained Elders under the Apoſtles. *Def.* p. 163.

Anſ. This Conceſſion proves not that *Timothy* was furniſhed with the ſame powers in *Greece* and *Macedonia*, as at *Epheſus*. For

1. It does not appear that *Timothy* was an Evangeliſt, when ſent to *Corinth*, &c. This is no where to be found in Scripture. But in St. *Paul's* ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, which was a great while after he had been ſent to *Corinth*, *Philippi* and *Theſſalonica*; then indeed 'tis intimated he was an Evangeliſt, and not before.

2. It ſeems Evident unto me, that *Timothy* was ſent unto *Greece* and *Macedonia*, for quite other purpoſes, than to govern thoſe Churches, and Ordain 'em Elders: His buſineſs at *Theſſalonica* was *To Eſtabliſh and comfort the Chriſtians there, concerning their Faith* (1 *Theſ.* 3.2.) And afterward, he went thither again to haſten their Contributions, as I conceive. His Buſineſs to *Corinth*, was to carry the Apoſtles Letter, concerning the *Corinthian* Schiſms and Contentions. We read of no Commiſſion given him to receive Accuſations, to reprove Offenders openly, to examine the Qualification of the Candidates for Holy Orders, or to Ordain Elders, either at *Corinth*, *Philippi* or *Theſſalonica*, as He had at *Epheſus*.

3. *Euſebius* (on whoſe Authority the Hypotheſis of unfixt Evangeliſts depends) deſcribes them thus, *They went from place to place, among thoſe who had not yet heard the Word of Faith*, Or where no Churches were as yet eſtabliſhed. But *Paul* had already planted Churches at *Corinth*, *Philippi* and *Theſſalonica*. Theſe then were not places proper for an unfixed Evangeliſt to be imploy'd in, and therefore *Timothy* did not the work of an *Evangeliſt* in thoſe Cities, that is, he had not the ſame Powers there, as at *Epheſus*. So that I ſtill call upon Mr. *O.* to prove *Timothy* was furniſhed with the ſame Powers in *Greece* and *Macedonia*, as he was after at *Epheſus*. *Euſeb.* E. H. l. 3. c. 37.

4. If *Timothy* had been furniſhed with the ſame Powers, at his going to *Greece* and *Macedonia*, as at *Epheſus*, why ſhould *Paul* reſolve for *Epheſus ſhortly*, there to inſtruct *Timothy* in his Office? And becauſe he foreſaw, that Journey might poſſibly be put off for a longer time, why did he diſpatch a Letter to *Timothy*, wherein in the mean while, he gives him the neceſſary Orders for the better Ruling of the Church? *Timothy*, I ſuppoſe was not ſo forgetful as to need theſe Inſtructions, if he had before been furniſhed with 'em, when he was ſent to *Corinth*, *Philippi* and *Theſſalonica*.

Mr. *O.* " A great part of *T. N.* is to prove, That Presbyters were not Supreme Governours, becauſe the Apoſtles " were above 'em: And yet that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Supreme Governours, " though the Apoſtles were above them alſo. Either the Elders were Supreme " Governours, or *Timothy* and *Titus* were not. *Def.* p. 165.

Anſ.

Anſ. I ſhew'd by Induction of Particulars, that the Preſbyters were ſubject unto the Apoſtles in every *ſingle Act* of Government: That either an Apoſtle, or a Prophet, was conſtantly at the Helm to guide and direct 'em. The Elders had not a diſcretionary Power in any Caſe, that we read of. But *Timothy* and *Titus* (though they alſo were ſubject to St. *Paul*, whenever he thought fit to interpoſe, yet) generally ſpeaking were left unto the Judgment of their own private Diſcretion, as appears from the Rules of Government preſcribed 'em by the Apoſtle. There is a manifeſt difference between *Timothy* and *Titus*, their ſubjection to the Apoſtle, and that of the Ordinary Elders: *See the Preface.*

Mr. *O.* Whereas in proof of many Congregations in the Church of *Epheſus*, I cited *Acts* 19. 10. *All they which dwelt in* Aſia *heard the Word of the Lord Jeſus.* And backed this with *Ignatius*'s calling himſelf the Biſhop of *Syria*, not of *Antioch* only, but of ſome conſiderable part of the adjacent Country. The Miniſter Replies, *This is little to the purpoſe, and that Men will talk any thing.* But

Anſ. Do not theſe Obſervations render it highly probable, that the *Epheſian* Church was alſo compoſed of ſeveral Aſſemblies in City and Country? And is not this a good account why a Biſhop, and many Preſbyters, and Deacons were employ'd in the Church of *Epheſus*, not ſerving one Congregation alone in the City, but others alſo in the Country round about called *Aſia*? If there had been but one Congregation at *Epheſus*, one Biſhop, or Preſbyter might have ſufficed. The Chriſtians at that time of day were not ſo wealthy, as to multiply Church-Officers more than needed. This is not (I confeſs) to Mr. *O*'s Purpoſe, but I hope 'twill be thought to mine.

Mr. *O.* further pleads "That the Rector (*underſtand in Order to prove there were* "*many Congregations in that Church*) *May as well ſay, that the Church of* Jeruſalem "*took in the* Parthians, *and dwellers in* Meſopotamia, Cappadocia, &c. *for all* "*theſe heard the Word of the Lord Jeſus.* Acts 2. 9, 11. as well as thoſe of "*Aſia* did.

Anſ. That's the thing which I do affirm. The *Parthians*, and Dwellers in *Meſopotamia* here mentioned, belonged unto the Church of *Jeruſalem*, ſo many of 'em, as were converted. For the *Dwellers* in *Meſopotamia*, v. 9. are ſaid to be *Dwellers* at *Jeruſalem*, v. 5. Κατοικοῦντες is the word in both places. Now if they Dwelt at *Jeruſalem*, can it be doubted, whether they belong'd to that Church? The Difficulty is, how the ſame Perſons ſhould be called *Dwellers* at *Jeruſalem*, and in *Meſopotamia* at the ſame time. To this I anſwer, Mr. *O.* is as much concerned as I am to give an account of the Difficulty. Nevertheleſs I'll venture to ſhoot my Bolt for once, leaving every Man Liberty to judge of it, as he ſees cauſe.

I am not ſatiſfy'd with their Opinion, who ſay that theſe *Dwellers* in *Meſopotamia*, &c. came up to *Jeruſalem* only for a time, to obſerve the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*. How then could they be called *Dwellers at Jeruſalem*?

Mr. *Mede B.* 1. *Diſc.* 20th being of this Opinion expounds Κατοικοῦντες v. 9. *a ſhort ſtay*, and v. 9th *a durable Manſion*, ſupporting his Expoſition by *Gen.* 27. 44. 1 *Kings* 17. 20. But 'tis not likely, *Luke* would uſe the ſame Word, in the ſame Period, in ſo different Senſes, and ſo perplex his Reader. I reckon then that many Jews, who formerly dwelt in *Meſopotamia, and were born there*, v. 8. had now ſhifted their Dwellings, and reſided at *Jeruſalem*. They who

who had before dwelt in *Meſopotamia*, did now dwell at *Jeruſalem*, in expectation as ſome think of the Meſſiah, and by conſequence the Church of *Jeruſalem*, might take in the Dwellers in *Meſopotamia*. And what is ſaid here of the Dwellers in *Meſopotamia*, muſt be apply'd unto the *Medes*, and *Parthians*, and *Cappadocians*, &c. More particularly, I thus explain it. There were at *Jeruſalem*, many Schools or Colleges, for the Education and Inſtruction of Youth in Religion. Theſe Colleges were built at the Charge of ſuch Jews as lived in Foreign Countries, and ſent their Youth to *Jeruſalem* to be brought up in the knowledge of their Law. Their Tutors or Inſtructors, were probably Natives of the ſame Countries. All theſe being born in Foreign Nations, and therefore called *Dwellers in them*, are nevertheleſs reckoned as at this time *Dwellers in Jeruſalem*, where they now reſided, and ſo being Converted, might become Members of the new Chriſtian Church at *Jeruſalem*. But this is a Matter of little moment in the preſent Controverſy.

Mr. O. "If the Power of conferring other Powers, is greater than thoſe other "Powers, then Biſhops, who make an Archbiſhop are greater than he is: and "ſo are Biſhops than Kings who they Crown, as alſo Recorders or Town-"Clerks, than Majors, whom they Swear.

Anſ. I know very well that my Propoſition is liable to ſeveral exceptions, which it is not worth while to trouble the Reader with. Its certain, that when a free People, Superior to the Candidate, elect themſelves a King, they are become ſubject to him, not greater than he is: And that becauſe they diveſt themſelves of the Power, which they put into the hands of another. The Caſe is the ſame, when Biſhops make an Archbiſhop. They ſubject themſelves to him, and thence-forward, he is their Superior. But this is not the Caſe before us. He who is poſſeſt of a Power, and is able alſo to conferr the ſame Power upon another, not diminiſhing nor deſtroying his own Power, muſt needs be greater than he who receives that Power, but is not able to give it to another. A Biſhop (as my ſuppoſition is) having Power to Miniſter in the Word and Sacraments, is alſo enabled to confer this Miniſtry upon others, that is to Ordain Preſbyters, and yet deprives not himſelf of it. He ſtill Miniſters in the Word and Sacraments himſelf. But he is greater than a Preſbyter, becauſe the Presbyter, though he has received the Power of Miniſtring in the Word and Sacraments, yet he cannot Ordain another unto that Office, as the Biſhop can. Nothing needs be plainer. But I will illuſtrate it by a known Inſtance. There are twenty four Knights of the Garter, the King is one of them. Every Knight of the Garter, cannot create a Fellow of the Order, but the Sovereign only. For which Reaſon He is called the *Sovereign*, and is greater than the other Companions of the Order are, I mean *quatenus* the *Sovereign Knight*. And therefore he is greater than the reſt; becauſe he is not only a Knight of the Garter, but can make one. I need not apply it.

As to Mr. *O*'s other Inſtances, they are but ſo many ſorry Miſtakes. It's the Hereditary Title or Election, which makes the King, and not he who is appointed to manage the publick Ceremony, of ſetting the Crown on the King's Head, and giving him the Oath. And Mayors, are made by the Election of the Free-Men of the Corporation, and not by the Town-Clerks or Recorders, who Swear them.

THE

THE APPENDIX.

Def. p. 153. MR *O.* whoſe manner it is to ſhuffle off Arguments which pinch him, by diverting his Reader, with Reflections on ſome caſual Corruptions, in the Adminiſtration of our Church-Government, takes Occaſion here to rally upon our Chancellors Commutings, or Diſpenſing with penace for Money.

Anſ. This is nothing to the Argument before us; this is no Scripture proof, that Presbyters ever Excommunicated, or ſuſpended. And though I will not take upon me to defend or palliate any unwarrantable Practice; yet I am of Opinion that ſome Corrupt Adminiſtrations, are not a ſufficient reaſon for deſtroying Governments, either Civil, or Eccleſiaſtical: for then an end muſt be put unto all Government whatever. Nor do I believe one Male-Adminiſtration can excuſe another: I mean Recrimination is no juſt Defence. Nevertheleſs againſt my Inclination, yea, and my Reſolution too, I'll for once walk a little out of my way, and tell Mr. *O.* a ſtory, by the bye, to the end he may not be too much conceited of the Integrity and Innocence of his own Party; but may thence ſee the Corruption of Humane Nature, and be convinced that Presbyterians are not ſo ſweet as ſome would have 'em thought to be; but when 'tis in their Power, they alſo can be willing to *Commute*, as well as other People.

" The ſecond Presbyterian Claſs, in the Province of *Lancaſter* (as 'twas called) " began at *Bury*, *March* 25. 1647. And continued there by Adjournments till " *February* 13th. 1650. In which ſpace of time they met often, as they declar-" ed, *By virtue of an Ordinance of Parliament*, not at all pretending to Divine " Commiſſion, that I find in the Records of that Claſs, which I have by me. " The Presbyterian Miniſters, and Lay-Elders, thus meeting were entertain'd, " or rather entertain'd themſelves, at the Houſe of one *John Redfern*, an Inn-" Keeper in the ſaid Town of *Bury*. I ſay entertained themſelves, for like true " Members of a Church Militant, and as if they had been real Soldiers, for the " ſetting up the Kingdom of Jeſus Church, they lived upon Free Quarter, or at " leaſt, run into their Landlord's Debt, above twenty Pounds. To give 'em " their due, they had ſome Deſign to pay him off, and to that end, were devi-" ſing to raiſe the Money out of the Purſes of ſuch as were Obnoxious to " their Spiritual Diſcipline, that's to ſay, they intended to *commute*, and Puniſh " the Offenders Purſes, inſtead of bringing them to the Stool of Repentance. " But *Oliver* it ſeems, trump't in their way and forbade the Bans, and ſo the " honeſt Men adjourned to freſh Quarters at *Bolton*. Thus poor *John Redfern* " was wronged, and no ſatisfaction could be had by fair means. But being aſk'd " why would he not ſue 'em, he reply'd ——— *No: the Remedy is worſe than the* " *Diſeaſe, and Juſtice is not to be had.* Here then we have an Example of, at leaſt, " *deſigned Commutation*, or which is worſe, of as Errant a piece of Roguery, as can

" Ordinarily

"Ordinarily be met with in Hiſtory. Here we have a Bevy of Presbyterian "Saints of the firſt Rate. Painful Preachers, and Zealous Lay-Elders gathered "together in the fear of God (ſo doubtleſs they were willing it ſhould be belie-"ved) to Reform the Country hereabouts, and yet giving an Example of the "moſt ſcandalous Knavery, ſuch as a good Heathen, or *Turk* would have been "aſhamed of.

I hope there is no Precedent in the Goſpel for this kind of Diſcipline.

If any queſtions the matter of Fact, as 'tis here related. I am able to prove it, when reaſonably required thereunto.

Mr. *O.* "The Rector ſuppoſes that ſome in the Church may "Rule well, who don't labour in the Word and Doctrine. *Def.* p. 156.

Anſ. I do ſo. But then at the ſame time I ſuppoſe 'em Ordained, not Lay-Elders.

Mr. *O.* When I alledged, *Heb.* 12. 15. in proof that Ἐπισκοπεῖν is not an Artificial Word, as Ἐπίσκοπος is, and obſerved that Believers are there exhorted, *To look diligently,* &c. Mr. *O.* aſks, *Are all Believers bid* ἐπισκοπεῖν *to look diligently to the Flock, as the Paſtors of it?*

Anſ. No. But becauſe it hence appears that the verb Ἐπισκοπεῖν is uſed in a common ſenſe applicable to any Man, therefore I conclude, that nothing of certainty can be argued from it, concerning the Power of Government. And I further ſay, that as Believers are not directed to play the Biſhops, *or to look diligently unto the Flock, as Paſtors of it,* ſo neither can it be proved, by this verb ἐπισκοπεῖν that Elders were *to look diligently unto the Flock, as the Supreme Paſtors of it,* or as *Timothy* and *Titus,* who were Commiſſioned to do ſo.

Mr. *O.* "*Who ſo bold as blind* Bayard. *Def.* p. 159.

Anſ. Whether Mr. *O.* expoſes the Rector, or his own Wit and good Breeding, by ſuch a rude and trivial Diverb, I leave to the Reader, to decide, Such a Clowniſh expreſſion, ſhews him to have converſ'd rather among rude Carters and Dray-Men, than Men of Polite Learning, or Celebrated Authors that he boaſts ſo much of, and pretends to be ſo wonderfully ſeen in.

Now the occaſion of this Elegant and ſpruce Queſtion is this. The Rector in *T. N.* repreſented his Hypotheſis borrowed from Biſhop *Pearſon,* as an Argument, which no Papiſt had ever thought on before. But Mr. *O.* belike has chop'd upon ſomething to that purpoſe, as he thought in the *Rhemiſh* Teſtament, for which cauſe I am here compared to a Blind Tit. 'Tis confeſt (though there's no need to confeſs it, as will appear preſently) I was not aware of that Paſſage of the *Rhemiſts*, and I am certain Biſhop *Pearſon* makes no mention of 'em, or of any other Author, which drew me into this miſtake, if it will prove one at laſt; but what if it ſhould? It does not in the leaſt affect me, that Mr. *O.* is able to find me once in an Errour. I pretend not to be infallible or Omniſcient. I have ſomewhat a better Proverb to excuſe my ſelf with, than Mr. *O.* had to revile me. *Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.* The good Old Man *Homer* himſelf, was not only blind, but aſleep too ſometimes. Nor would I trouble my ſelf to make more Words on this ſlight Occaſion, were it not that I think my ſelf obliged to vindicate Biſhop *Pearſon,* leaſt any one ſhould ſurmiſe, that he was beholden to the *Rhemiſts* for his New Chronology, about the time when *Paul* beſought *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus,* and yet had not the Ingenuity to acknowledge it. Let us then in the firſt place produce the *Rhemiſts* Words, which are as follows.

M "This

Rhemiſh Argument before the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*.

" This Epiſtle was written, as it ſeems after *Paul's* firſt " Impriſonment in *Rome*, when he was diſmiſſed and ſet at " Liberty, and thereupon it is, that he might ſay here, " *I hope to come to thee quickly* (1 Tim. 3. 14.) *That's to ſay* " *at Epheſus*, where he had deſired him to remain.

Anſ. But though the *Rhemiſts* here ſtumbled upon a ſmall part of the Truth, they offer'd nothing in Confirmation of it, neither in the Argument, nor in their Obſervations upon the Epiſtle it ſelf. Nor (which is to be noted) did they in the leaſt make uſe of their Opinion in proof of Epiſcopacy: But Biſhop *Pearſon* did both, without being beholden to the *Rhemiſts*, for one Syllable towards the Eſtabliſhment of this New Chronology.

Moreover the *Rhemiſts*, ſpeak only of the Time of *Paul's* writing this Epiſtle, not of his Beſeeching *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, at his going into *Macedonia*: concerning which they have not given the leaſt intimation, but left that part of the Old Chronology as they found it. Only they ſeem to think that *Paul*, having long before his Impriſonment beſought *Timothy* to abide at *Epheſus*, did now, after he was Diſmiſſed and ſet at Liberty, *viz.* about the time that he wrote to the *Hebrews*, and immediately after his Enlargement, ſend this Letter unto *Timothy*, which is an Hypotheſis quite different from that of Biſhop *Pearſon's*, as any one that underſtands, and remembers what has already been offered upon the Argument, will readily confeſs. So that the Learned Prelate was not in the leaſt beholden unto the Seminary at *Rhemes*, for the Diſcovery and proof of this New Chronology, *the Time of* Paul's *beſeeching* Timothy *to abide at* Epheſus.

There was then little Occaſion for Mr. *O's* challenging me with *Boldneſs*, and giving me that undeſerv'd Character——*That when I am remoteſt from Truth I am then moſt confident.* I leave it to my Adverſaries themſelves, the Diſſenters, to determine, which of the two is in the point of Time now debated, guilty of moſt Confidence. Well, but

Mr. *O. Thought of this Argument before the Rector publiſhed it.*

Anſ. Haply ſo, but the Queſtion is, whether he ever thought of it before Biſhop *Pearſon* brought it to Light. And if he has been ſo long acquainted with it, as he would have us think, or has prepared a *Diſſertation* to vindicate the Old Chronology, as he boaſts, I hope 'twill be better put together than his *Defence*, and that one time or other, we ſhall be bleſt with a ſight of ſo Elaborate a piece of Work: in the mean while, I am of Opinion, that if Mr. *O.* had been ſo long acquainted with this New Chronology, and had prepared a Diſſertation to vindicate the Old one, his *Defence* would have been more tight and correct, than I find it; His *Plea*, would have had ſomething in it ſurely, relating to this New Chronology. In fine, that Mr. *O.* thought of the Biſhop's Argument, before the Rector's Book came forth, is not material; but that He thought of it before the Rector propoſed it to him, we have only his own Word for it, which is not much worth in this caſe of Self-Teſtimony; Yea, granting this alſo, I have good reaſon to believe he derived this part of his knowledge from Biſhop *Pearſon*, for a Reaſon beſt known to my ſelf.

Def. p. 163. Mr. *O.* has wonderfully demonſtrated, from 2 *Tim.* 4. 9. 21. That *Paul* ſent for *Timothy* to him at *Rome*, what no Body ever deny'd; and yet he has not hereby proved, that *Timothy* was ever in the Apoſtle's Company, after he was beſought to abide at *Epheſus*, 'Tis not out of doubt

doubt to me that *Timothy* ſaw *Paul* at *Rome*; though he ſent for him. For not to ſpeak of other Obſtacles, *Paul* might have been Martyred by the Emperor's Special and ſudden Command, before *Timothy* reached *Rome*. This is very likely, if we conſider the State of Affairs at *Rome* about that time, as we read 'em ſet forth in the *Annals of Paul*.

What I excepted againſt in Dr. *Whitaker*, was not that which Mr. *O.* pretends to make Anſwer to, but that he aſſerted *Equals could receive Accuſations as* Timothy *did*. This the *Dr.* proved (if Mr *Prinn* wrongs him not) from a Synod of Biſhops, who received an Accuſation againſt one of their own Number, and then Cenſured him for his Fault. Now how far this is from a proof of what it was alledged for, I ſhewed at large, and Mr. *O.* who Taxes me for ſo doing overlooks it, nor makes any Reply to it. Indeed it is not to be Anſwered if it be true, as I think none will deny, that one Biſhop is not equal, but Inferior and Subject to a Synod of Biſhops. Therefore a Synod's receiving an Accuſation againſt a Biſhop, is no proof of the Doctor's Aſſertion, but an Inſtance of the contrary.

As for Mr. *O*'s own examples out of St. *Cyprian*, were they never ſo convincing (which ſhall in its place be conſidered) they will not however Vindicate Dr. *Whitaker*, nor are a proper Anſwer to my Exceptions againſt him.

The proportion of Dioceſes, how large at moſt they ought to be, is not my buſineſs to determine, as I undertake not to define how big a Pariſh or Congregation ought to be. I ſuppoſe the *ultimum quod ſic*, and the Limits *quos ultra citraque nequit conſiſtere Rectum*, are in both uncertain: and are only to be adjuſted *prout viri prudentes definiverint*, as Superiors ſhall think fit to Order, and not by the Caprice and humourſome phancy of every overweening Opinionaniſt, and ſelf conceited Reformer. *Def.* p. 166.

Mr. *O.* *hears the Rectors Pariſh has four or five Chappels in it.* *Def.* p. 167.

Anſ. The Rectors Pariſh has neither five nor four Chappels in it. Tho' the Miniſters Ears be never ſo long, yet is he miſtaken herein. If it had twenty, 'tis nothing to the purpoſe.

Mr. *O.* Becauſe the Rector affirm'd it no more impoſſible for *Timothy* (ſuppoſed then the Angel of the Chruch of *Epheſus*, mentioned *Rev.* 2.) *To leave his firſt Love*, than for *Judas* to betray his Maſter, is mightily diſturbed, and to confute it muſters up many Commendations given of *Timothy* in Scripture. *Def.* p. 178.

Anſ. In *T. N.* I declared my Opinion plainly, that *Timothy* was not that Angel there ſpoken of: yet ſuppoſing it, 'twas not impoſſible for *Timothy* to be guilty of ſome Defection. The Commendations alone render it not impoſſible. Abſtracting from Matter of Fact then, that *Judas* an Apoſtle, who had the Power of Caſting out Devils, ſhould turn Apoſtate, is as ſtrange, as that *Timothy* ſhould leave his firſt Love. Laſtly, when 'tis for his turn, Mr. *O.* can admit, that *Timothy* might be overtaken with *Youthful Luſts*, but when he wants an Occaſion of Cavilling, then 'tis monſtrous horrid to ſuppoſe it poſſible for *Timothy* to be guilty of ſome Defection from the Truth. If the one was poſſible, why not the other? But eſpecially if the νεωτερικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι ſpoken of 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. Signifie the Luſts of the Mind, its proneneſs to Paradoxes, to New up-ſtart Opinions, curious Conceipts, and Innovations in Religion, of which kind we reckon Preſbytery and Independency, which are but of Yeſterday, and the pro-

duct of Minds addicted unto Novelties. I do not find Commentators Ordinarily Expounding the *νεωτερικαὶ ἐπιθυμίας*, Youthful, *i. e. Fleſhly* Luſts, but to the Senſe I have now given them. In a Word, whoever attentively reads *Rev.* 2. 2, 3, 6. will find conſiderable Commendations of the Angel of *Epheſus*, perhaps not much Inferior to thoſe of *Timothy* in other places of Scripture; And yet this Angel *left his firſt Love*. 'Twas not impoſſible then, but *Timothy* might do ſo likewiſe.

I have now done with Mr. *O*'s *Defence*. If I have left any thing of Moment unanſwered; Or if I have failed giving full ſatisfaction to any Material Difficulty Objected againſt me, I do promiſe either to ſupply theſe Defects, or fairly to confeſs my ſelf unable. Only I could wiſh all perſonal Reflections, and unneceſſary Digreſſions might be laid aſide, that Arguments be plainly propoſed, and in as few words as may be, that no trickiſh and evaſive Anſwers be made, when we have nothing elſe to reply. And finally, that we would not take to task a piece of an Argument, and the weakeſt part of it too, and then make the Reader believe we have fully accounted for the Difficulty, when in Truth we kept our ſelves all the while at a diſtance, and never came near the Merits of the Cauſe.

THE

THE

SECOND PART:

Wherein

All Mr *Owen*'s Authorities for *Presbyterian Parity*, and Ordination by *Presbyters* are overthrown; and particularly is prov'd,

THAT

The Church of *ENGLAND*,

Ever ſince the Reformation,

HELD

The Divine Apoſtolical Right of EPISCOPACY.

Ἔδει μὲν γὰρ καὶ πᾶν, ὁτιοῦν παθεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ διακόψαι τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ἦν οὐκ ἀδοξοτέρα τῆς ἕνεκεν τοῦ μὴ σχίσαι μαρτυρία, κατ' ἐμὲ δὲ καὶ μείζων, &c.

One ought to endure to the utmoſt rather than divide the Church of God: and dying rather than rend it in pieces, is a no leſs glorious Martyrdom, and in my Opinion greater *than being a Martyr for not Sacrificing unto Idols.* In this latter Caſe a Man ſuffers for his own ſake only, in the former for the whole Church. *Dionyſ. Alexand. apud Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 6. *c.* 45.

LONDON:

Printed in the Year 1699.

THE

INTRODUCTION.

HAving ſpoken of the Government of the Chriſtian Church in General, and as far as the Holy Scriptures afford us any Light: Having thence ſhewn that meer Presbyters alone did never exerciſe any Supreme Act of Juriſdiction of any kind that can be there diſcovered, except in Conjunction with, and ſubordination to ſome extraordinary Officers as Apoſtles or Prophets: Having in particular traced the manner of Government at Epheſus, unto the Death of St. John the Apoſtle; and the Martyrdom of St. Ignatius, and found it caſt by St. Paul into the ſame Form, as the Church of England is at this Day, viz. conſiſting of three diſtinct Orders of Miniſters (the Title only of the Supreme Governours haply excepted) and ſo continued after him, as I ſaid unto the time of Ignatius: And Laſtly, having anſwered all the Objections raiſed againſt our Epiſcopal Government, by Mr. O. in his Book Entituled A Plea, &c. (So many of 'em, I mean, as ſeemed to carry any weight in them, and concerned the times, within the Compaſs of which I have confin'd my ſelf hitherto, that's to ſay, the Apoſtolical Age.) After all this, it remains that I conſider the Arguments, which to the ſame purpoſe he has drawn from Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, beginning where the Scriptures ends, and ſo deſcending unto theſe laſt Ages, before which time Epiſcopacy was never brought into Queſtion for Fifteen Hundred Years, ſave by one Arch-Heretick Aërius, of whom more hereafter. My Adverſary indeed thinks he has found in Old Authors many Inſtances, favouring the Presbyterian Identity and Parity, and Ordination by Presbyters: This is now to be Examined. If my Anſwers ſhall be thought Old, I have this excuſe for my ſelf, that the Objections are old alſo; and in ſuch a Caſe it is pardonable if not neceſſary, eſpecially when an Adverſary demands, and even duns, yea and reproaches one for not having already undertaken it. I pretend not then to make new diſcoveries never heard of before, in the Controverſy now before us, (though haply ſome few things not obſerved before, may be here offered to the Reader) but to apply the proper Anſwers unto the Old Objections, wherewith Mr. O. has endeavoured to embroil and perplex the Truth. I will not tie my ſelf unto his Method, which is not ſo well fitted to my deſign, it being my purpoſe to Manage the Diſpute only upon Matters of Fact, which being once cleared from countenancing the Presbyterian or Congregational Polities, Mr. O's. Syllogiſms will and muſt fall to the Ground. I will then digeſt and diſpoſe all his Authorities, and my Replies to 'em, though not exactly (for the controverſy hangs not on the Niceties of Chronology) yet pretty near to the Order of Time, to which they belong. I begin with the Epiſtle of Clemens Romanus unto the Church of Corinth, which is the beſt Colourable Argument the Diſſenters do or can bring for themſelves.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Of the Teſtimony of Clemens Romanus.

THE ſubſtance of what Mr. *O.* argues from this Epiſtle againſt Prelatical Epiſcopacy, and in favour of Presbyterian Parity is, whereas I affirm in *T. N.* Clement *ſeems to make* the Jewiſh High-Prieſt, the Inferior Prieſts and *Levites* a Precedent for the Government of Chriſtian Churches by a Biſhop, Presbyters and Deacons—— "That *Clement* no where ſaith there were thoſe three diſtinct "Officers in the Chriſtian Church; Or that the Jewiſh Go- "vernment was a Pattern of the Chriſtian: That *Clement* "mentions but two Orders, *viz.* Biſhops and Deacons; That He calls theſe "Biſhops Presbyters: That they governed the Church of *Corinth* in common; "That He mentions no chief Biſhop there; That he exhorts the *Corinthians* "to be ſubject unto their Elders; That *Clemens*, ought to be expounded by "Scripture, *Philip.* 1. 1. and 1 *Tim.* 3. In both which places two only Orders are "to be met with; That *Clemens* does not intend to affirm there were three kinds "of Officers in the Chriſtian Church as in the Moſaical; but only that both the "one, and the other Church, (that is the Moſaical with three Orders, and "the Chriſtian with two) were both eſtabliſhed by the ſame Divine Authority. Unto all which it's reply'd; *Def.* p. 49. 50, 51.

1. I readily grant *Clement* no where *expreſly* affirms there were three diſtinct Orders in the Chriſtian Church: or that the High-Prieſts, Prieſts and *Levites* in the Jewiſh Church, were the Pattern of Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Chriſtian. Thus much is granted: Nevertheleſs, what I cited him for may be true, and is ſo, *ſc.* That He *ſeems to make* the Jewiſh Government the Pattern of the Chriſtian, as we are wont to argue from him, comparing the one with the other. One would think this joined with *Jerom's* Teſtimony, cited with it in *T. N. pag.* 1. were ſufficient to warrant me thus modeſtly to affirm, that *Clemens ſeems to make* the Jewiſh Government a Pattern of the Chriſtian, which others before me have done: as Dr. *H.* in his Diſſertations, and Dr. *Beveredge*, *Cod. Can.* &c. *l.* 2. *c.* 11.

But Mr. *Mede* deſerves particularly to be taken notice of, who has more than once declared his Judgment in this matter. Let us hear him teaching us that, *In things for which we find no rule given in the New Teſtament, there we are referred, and left to the Analogy of the Old.* He inſtances in St. *Paul* arguing, for the maintenance of the Miniſters of the Goſpel (1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14) in Infant Baptiſm, in hallowing the firſt Day of the Week, in the three Orders, Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, aſſerted by *Jerom* to be derived from *Aaron*, his Sons, and the *Levites*; and Laſtly, in this Paſſage of St. *Clement* to the ſame purpoſe. Once more He Expounds thoſe B. 2. p. 435.

Words,

Ib. p. 413. Words, in *Clemens Romanus* to the *Corinthians*—*We ought to do all things in Order, as the Lord has commanded*, putting the Queſtion to himſelf thus, *Where has the Lord commanded this?* and anſwering himſelf thus, *In the Analogy of the Old Teſtament.* Now *Clemens* in the next following parts of his Epiſtle, treats in general *of the time when* the Chriſtian Miniſtrations were to be performed, *the place where*, and *the Perſons by whom.* If then the Analogy of the Law was a Divine Commiſſion unto the Chriſtians, if the Temple of the Jews, a Precedent of the Chriſtian Churches, if the Jewiſh Sabbath, of the Chriſtian Lord's-Day, why not the *Levitical* three Orders of the Chriſtian Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons? But that which is of moſt moment is, that many other Fathers following *Clemens* (as *Jerom*, *Syneſius*, *Cyprian* and *Firmilianus*, of whom I have ſpoken elſewhere) did not forget to allude or appeal to the Law of *Moſes*, in confirmation of the three Orders of Church-Officers among the Chriſtians. St. *Cyprian* ſaid, *He had a Divine Law to puniſh his rebellious Deacon*, Quoting *Deut.* 17. 12. *Numb.* 16. 1. Here He thinks himſelf inveſted with the ſame Authority as *Aaron* was, and through *Aaron* to have received it from God. The like we meet with in ſeveral other Epiſtles. And indeed the names *Sacerdos*, *Sacerdotium*, *Altare*, *Sacrificium*, *Oblationes*, &c. ſo familiarly uſed by the Ancients (and by our *Clement* himſelf) to expreſs the Chriſtian Officers, and Offices, imply as much. It may then with Reaſon be ſuppoſed that *Clement* intended the ſame.

St. *Cyp.* Ep. 3. *Oxon.*

Ep. 4. 59. 66. 69. and 73.

2. As I acknowledge *Clemens* did not *totidem verbis* aſſert the Orders, ſo I obſerve that though He expreſly mentions two only, yet he affirms no where, that there were two only kinds of Officers in the Church of *Corinth*, and no more. Or thus, though he mentions two only, yet he denies not *expreſly*, but that there might be a third.

3. I join iſſue with Mr. *O.* that *Clement* ought to be expounded by the Scripture; but ſurely not by the two places only which he has alledged, all the reſt being laid aſide. The Epiſtle then of *Clemens* muſt be Expounded by the Whole Scripture, and what Intimations of three Orders are any where therein to be found. This has been done already, and needs not be drawn in here again, to lengthen and confound the Argument. Only thus briefly to the two Paſſages adduced by Mr. *O.* Though St. *Paul*, *Philip.* 1. 1. mentions Biſhops and Deacons only, and no third Superior Officer in that Church; yet *Chap.* 2. 25. He calls *Epaphroditus* (by whom he ſent this Epiſtle) the Apoſtle of the *Philippians*; and though 1 *Tim.* 3. *ch.* He names Biſhops and Deacons only, and no third Officer, yet (as I hope has been ſufficiently made out) he had conſtituted *Timothy* Ruler of the Church of *Epheſus*, and particularly of the Elders there. So that there were at *Philippi* three Orders, an Apoſtle, Biſhops (or Preſbyters) and Deacons. Likewiſe at *Epheſus*, *Timothy* the Ruler of that Church, and Biſhops (or Preſbyters) and Deacons: and the ſame is to be believed of the Church of *Corinth*, when *Clement* wrote to 'em, if we will ſuffer our ſelves to be guided by Scripture and Reaſon.

4. That *Clemens* exhorted the *Corinthians* to be ſubject unto the Preſbyters, is certain. But ſo did *Ignatius* require, that the Churches ſhould be ſubject to their Preſbyters, tho' at the ſame time he urged the Chriſtians, and ſpecially the Preſbyters themſelves to be ſubject to the Biſhop. The Flock may be ſubject to the Preſbyters,

Preſbyters, and at the ſame time they and the Preſbyters ought to be ſubject to the
Biſhop. Again, that the Preſbyters governed the Church in common, is not
queſtioned, but that they did ſo without a Biſhop, is no where *expreſly* ſaid. Laſtly,
that *Clemens expreſly* mentions no Chief Biſhop at *Corinth*, I own; eſpecially, not by
the name Biſhop: but ſtill *He ſeems* to ſpeak of an Order of Church-
Officers, Superior to, and diſtinct from Preſbyters. Page the *Edit. Pat. Jun.*
ſecond commending the peaceable Behaviour of the *Corinthians*,
in time paſt, He writes, *that they had been* ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ἢ τιμὴν
τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. *Subject to their Rulers, and giving*
convenient honour unto the Preſbyters. And again p. 33. *Let us worſhip the Lord Je-*
ſus Chriſt, let us reverence our Governours (προηγουμένους) *Let us honour our Preſby-*
ters. One would think here is ſufficient Intimation of an Order of Church Of-
ficers Superior unto Preſbyters, and diſtinct from them.

5. *Clemens* was himſelf Biſhop, or Supreme Ruler of the Church of God
at *Rome*, being (as 'tis thought) the ſame Perſon that we read of *Philip.* 4. 3.
Now 'tis not at all likely, that *Clement* a Perſon of unqueſtionable Piety and In-
tegrity, being a Prelatical Biſhop himſelf at *Rome*, ſhould approve or counte-
nance the Presbyterian Party at *Corinth*; and that thoſe two Apoſtolical
Churches, ſhould thus widely differ in their Form of Government.

6. It may deſerve our Obſervation, what *Clement* writes towards the Conclu-
ſion of his Epiſtle, p. 69. thus——— "Whoever among you is Generous and
" Charitable let him reſolve thus, If the Sedition, Contention, and Schiſms are
" riſen on my account, I'll be gone where-ever ye will, and whatever the Peo-
" ple require, that I'll do; only let the Flock of Chriſt, and *the Preſbyters* ſet o-
" ver them, live in Peace. Methinks the Author in theſe Words, plainly e-
nough diſtinguiſhes between that *Generous* Perſon firſt ſpoken of, and a conſide-
rable part of the Preſbyters immediately after mentioned ſeparately from him.
This *Generous* Perſon was it ſeems ſettled in ſome Poſt or Office, by one Party
of the *Corinthians*, or at leaſt continued in it, againſt the Mind and Inclination
of the Reſt. From hence ſprang the Quarrels and Schiſms among 'em. Now
what Office could this be, but that of the Prelatical Biſhop? He could not be a
meer Preſbyter, for he's plainly diſtinguiſhed from them. And beſides, 'tis not
to be imagined that one common Preſbyter, equal with the Reſt, ſhould have
been the occaſion of ſuch a dangerous Schiſm, or that his Abſence ſhould im-
mediately put an end to it, as 'tis here imply'd. Nor will any one (I believe)
ſay, that He was a Deacon, much leſs an Ordinary Believer. He was then (as
I conceive) the Prelate of that Church: but not acceptable to one party of the
Corinthians, and on this Occaſion the Peace of the Church was diſturbed. *Cle-*
ment not intermeddling among 'em as to the Merits of the Cauſe, adviſes this
Generous Perſon out of Charity, and for the Peace of the Church, to abdicate
and depart from his Office, to the end, ſome other ſucceeding with the Univer-
ſal Conſent of the *Corinthians*, by this means a Period might be put unto their
Diviſions. In further proof of this, I offer unto Conſideration, what I long
ſince wrote in my *Clement* upon the Margin, but was not ſo happy as to refer to
the Author whence I had taken that Note; 'Tis this, " That from the Paſſage
" of *Clement's* Epiſtle juſt before ſet down at length *Epiphanius* and others, after
" him conjecture, that *Clement* was named by *Peter* to be Biſhop of *Rome*, and
" the Apoſtles immediate Succeſſor, but refuſed it for a like Reaſon, that he here

“exhorts the *Generous* Perſon at *Corinth*, to lay down his “Office. Now ’twas very proper for *Clemens*, to urge his own reaſon and example, and eſpecially ſince his Modeſty, and Condeſcenſion gained him afterward the Affections of that Church, and at length advanced him unto the Biſhoprick of *Rome*. The like he hints unto this *Generous* Perſon, as a Motive to him to reſign, in the next Period. *He* (ſays Clement) *who ſhall do thus, ſhall procure to himſelf great Glory in the Lord, and every place* (every Church) *will receive him.*

We have a like ſtory of *Greg. Nazianzen* Biſhop of *Con.* who whilſt many were contending about that Biſhoprick, even when he was legally poſ-ſeſs’d of it, openly before all and of his own accord, ſaid——*If I be the* Jonas *that raiſes the Storm, throw me into the Sea, and let theſe Tempeſts ceaſe: I am willing to undergo whatever you have a mind to, to be Baniſhed the Throne, and to be caſt out of the City. Only be careful to Love Truth and Peace.* And ſo he Voluntarily departed. See St. *Chryſ. Hom.* 11. *in Epheſ.*

Epiph. Vol. 1. l. 1. Adverſ. *Hæreſ.* To. 2. n. 6. *Edit. Pariſ.*

The Paſſage in *Epiphanius* whereof I ſpeak, is in *Engliſh* as follows——Peter *and* Paul, *were both the firſt Apoſtles and Biſhops of* Rome, *then* Linus, *afterward* Cletus, *and next him* Clement, *Contemporary of* Peter *and* Paul. *Nor let any one wonder, that others before* Clement *received the Epiſcopacy from the Apoſtles, ſeeing* Clement *was their Contemporary. Whether He received Ordination to the Epiſcopacy and declined it, ἀνα-[illegible] αὐτῆς, whilſt they (the Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul*) ſurviv’d, for He ſays in one of his Epiſtles, ἀναχωρῶ, ἄπειμι, εἰρηνευέτω ὁ λαὸς Θεοῦ. I depart, I am gone, let the People of God abide in Peace, deſigning this for others Good and advantage: or whether &c.*

Apud Clementem ἀναχωρῶ, ἄπειμι, μόνον τὸ ποίμνιον εἰρηνευέτω, &c.

It may perhaps be objected, that *Clement* aſcribes not the *Corinthian* Schiſms to that one Generous Perſon only, but to ſome miſunderſtandings between the People, and the Preſbyters, ſome of the latter being not ſuffered to continue in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry any longer at *Corinth*. So ’tis intimated, pag. 58. in theſe Words——*It would be no little Sin in us, to caſt off thoſe (Presbyters or Biſhops) who have diſcharged the Office of their Miniſtry, holily and without blame; for we ſee that they have removed ſome (Presbyters) whoſe Converſation was laudable, and who exerciſed their Miniſtry among you blameleſly. Brethren, &c.*

All that needs be anſwered hereunto is,

1. *Clement* manifeſtly teaches elſewhere, that the Schiſm aroſe on the account of one (or two Perſons) *p.* 62. *’Tis* (ſays He) *a ſhame, an arrant ſhame, and unworthy a Chriſtians Converſation, that the ancient and moſt firmly eſtabliſhed Church* (of Corinth) *ſhould raiſe Sedition againſt the Presbyters,* δι’ ἓν ἢ δύο πρόσωπα, for one or two Perſons: that there being a Difference among them about their Biſhop (that *Generous* Perſon) it muſt needs follow, that the Preſbyters were involved in the Controverſy, and by Conſequence, that ſome of ’em were deſerted, and laid aſide by thoſe of the People, who had an averſion to the Biſhop (that Generous Perſon ſo oft mentioned) as well as to ſome of the Preſbyters, who ſtuck cloſe to him. 2. It may reaſonably be thought that the two Perſons here ſpoken of, were the Biſhop in Poſſeſſion, and the other whom the *Corinthians* would

would have advanced into his Room. In ſhort, if what on this Head has been offered for the clearing the Riſe of the *Corinthian* Schiſm, and the meaning of the Epiſtle (which to us at this diſtance is dark enough) be of any moment, it may then be allowed, that *Clement* has intimated, that there was at *Corinth* a Prelatical Biſhop, and that the Reaſon why he makes no plainer mention of him, but was forced himſelf to interpoſe, in procuring the Peace of the Church of *Corinth*, was the Prejudices a great part of the Preſbyters, and People had conceived againſt their Biſhop, who was therefore unable by his own Authority, to allay the Heats and Contentions among 'em, and for that cauſe was adviſed by *Clement* Voluntarily to ſurrender his Office and depart.

It is not an uncommon thing for Authors to comprehend three Orders of Church-Officers in two Words, or at leaſt to mention two Orders only, when yet they acknowledge a Third. This Dichotomy is to be met with in the Scripture it ſelf. The three Officers of the Jewiſh Church, are frequently expreſſed by Prieſts and *Levites*, wherein the High-Prieſt, who without controverſy was a Third, is included. *Clement* himſelf in this Epiſtle takes notice——*That the Prieſts and* Levites, *came out of* Abraham'*s Loins*; meaning the High-Prieſt alſo, as I preſume will not be denyed: For he alſo came out of the Loins of *Abraham*. *Clemens Alexand.* in his *Stromata*, cited by Mr. *O.* ſpeaks there only of the two Orders, Preſbyters and Deacons, in the Chriſtian Church, and yet elſewhere, he reckons up expreſly the Biſhops alſo with the other two. In the former place, therefore Preſbyters muſt comprehend Biſhops; at leaſt they ought not to be excluded, though the Author there omits them. So *Tertullian* in his Apologetick comprehends Biſhops, and Preſbyters under one common Name *Seniores*, yet he expreſly diſtinguiſhes the Three Orders, *in Lib. de Baptiſmo c.* 17. *Optatus Milevit.* an hundred times o'er acknowledges the three Orders, yet once he contents himſelf, to expreſs 'em in two Words only, Biſhops and Deacons. *There are* (ſays he in the place cited on the Margin) *quatuor genera Capitum, Four Orders of Men in the Church*; but he ſums 'em up in three Words, *viz. Biſhops, Deacons, and the Faithful.* It may deſerve obſervation, that at this time of the Day, and with *Opiatus*, ordinarily Biſhop ſignify'd the Prelate of a Church; ſhall I then be allowed hence to infer there were either no Preſbyters, or no Prelatical Biſhops according to this Fathers Judgment, becauſe forſooth, He here mentions 'em not diſtinctly? It cannot be fairly Collected hence, as every one ſees. This is manifeſt that *Optatus*, in thoſe two Words, Biſhops and Deacons, muſt underſtand the three Orders, Biſhops, Preſbyters and Deacons, elſe He loſes one of his four Orders of Men in the Church. Beſides ſaying here (*ſicut ſupra dixi*) he refers us backward to *p.* 16. and *p.* 51. in both which places he mentions diſtinctly Biſhops, Preſbyters and Deacons. Wherefore the Premiſſes conſidered, 'tis reaſonable to believe, that *Clemens Romanus* likewiſe did, in the ſame manner expreſs the three Offices of the *Corinthian* Church in two Words, comprehending the Prelate in Biſhops and Deacons. It ought not here to be forgot, what St. *Chryſoſtom* has obſerved, *Preſbyters of old were called Biſhops alſo and Deacons*: for indeed Preſbyters in ſome things reſemble both.

P. 40, 41.

Id. Cl. Strom. and *Pædag.* cited by Biſhop *Pearſon* in his *Vindiciæ Ign. Epiſt.*

Opt. Milev. Ed. Caſaub. Lond. p. 66.

In Ep. *ad Philip.* ch. 1. 1.

They

They Miniſter (like Deacons) unto the Biſhop whilſt he Officiates, and are ſubject unto him as the other are: But they Miniſter in the Word and Sacraments, as well as the Biſhop does, and have under him the over-ſight of ſome part of the Flock; for which reaſon they may not incongruouſly be called Biſhops. But, *Blundel* (and his Followers, I remember) to reconcile unto their own Hypotheſis, the different way of the Fathers reckoning up the Miniſterial Orders of the Chriſtian Church, aſſerts, that ſometimes they conform their Language to the Scripture and Apoſtolical Age; At other times to their own Cuſtoms, and the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions. In the former caſe they uſe the Dichotomy mentioning only Presbyters (or Biſhops) and Deacons: in the latter they divide 'em into three Ranks, Biſhops, and Prieſts, and Deacons. But this device will not do their Work, and muſt be laid aſide, for the following Reaſons.

1. St. *Cyprian*, againſt whoſe Teſtimony for Epiſcopacy this Diſtinction was principally levelled and framed, though He often falls into the Dichotomy, yet aſſerts, the Divine Right of Biſhops. *Cum hoc igitur (ſicut omnis Actus Eccleſiæ per eoſdem præpoſitos gubernetur) divinâ lege fundatum ſit*——*The Government of the Church by Biſhops is* (ſays He) *founded upon a Divine Law.* That the *Præpoſiti* here are meant Biſhops is not to be doubted of, if we look backward unto the foregoing parts of this Epiſtle. He begins it thus——*Our Lord, whoſe precepts we ought to Reverence, and Obſerve, eſtabliſhing the Honour of the Biſhop and the Churches affairs, ſays,* &c. And again he adds——*Hence the Ordination of Biſhops and the Affairs of the Church, paſs* [illegible] *through the courſe of Times and Succeſſions, ſo that the Church is eſtabliſhed on Biſhops, and every Act of the Church is governed,* per eoſdem Præpoſitos, *by the ſame* Præpoſiti, that is, Biſhops. If then Biſhops were by Divine Right in the Judgment of *Cyprian*, he muſt ſpeak in the Language of the Apoſtolical Age, where the Divine Right ends, as well as his own, when he reckons up the three diſtinct Orders of Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons. But of this ſee more in Mr. *Dodwell's* 10th *Cypr.* Diſſertation. Nor can theſe *Præpoſiti* and *Epiſcopi*, be underſtood of Presbyters; for *Cyp.* (whatever any may fancy of *Præpoſiti*) never calls Presbyters, Biſhops; Nor could he conformably to his own Writings. He profeſſes thus of himſelf and other Biſhops—*Neq; enim quiſquam noſtrum Epiſcopum ſe Epiſcoporum conſtituit. None of us makes himſelf a Biſhop of Biſhops.* But if the Presbyters were Biſhops, then *Cyprian* was a Biſhop of Biſhops.

St. *Cyp*. Ep. 33.

Tract. Concil. Carthag. de Baptiſ. Hæret. P. 229.

2. *Optatus* in the ſame Breath, in one ſhort Period expreſſes himſelf both ways, as well in the Bipartite, as in the Tripartite Form. Therefore he muſt ſurely be underſtood to reſpect one and the ſame Age in the ſame Sentence. If he had therein an Eye unto the Apoſtolical Age, *Blundel's* Diſtinction is of no Advantage to our Adverſaries. Still upon that ſuppoſition, there were three Orders in the Apoſtles time: If He referred to his own Age, then although He comprehends 'em in two Words, yet was there three Orders of Miniſters in the Church.

3. *Ignatius* can with no Colour of reaſon be ſuppoſed to look to any other than the Apoſtolical Age, wherein he lived a great while, and was Martyr'd but about ten Years after the Apoſtle St. *John*. His three Orders therefore Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, were not, ſtrictly ſpeaking, of Eccleſiaſtical, but

but Apoſtolical Conſtitution. By conſequence *Blondel's* device makes nothing for the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters.

4. It no manner of way relieves our Adverſaries, from our Argument grounded on the Scriptures, which uſe the Dichotomy, and in it comprehend the three Jewiſh Orders, the High-Prieſts, the ſecond Prieſts and the *Levites*. In conformity whereunto the Fathers, may be thought to have ſummed up the Chriſtian Miniſters in two Words alſo.

If it be asked, with what Congruity could the Fathers ſo often fall into this Dichotomy, and yet at the ſame time believe the three Orders to be by Apoſtolical Conſtitution? The Anſwer is eaſy. Except the Ruling part, that's to ſay, the Adminiſtration of the Church Government, and Diſcipline, otherwiſe the Presbyters were and ſtill are among us, as it were equal to Biſhops, *&c.* in the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments, wherein they Officiate as effectually as the Biſhops themſelves: for which Reaſon they may be accounted the Biſhops Peers, and both not unfitly called by one common name. Even as I before obſerved from St. *Chryſoſtom*, Presbyters are comprehended in Deacons, as agreeing in ſome things common to both.

8. And in the laſt place that which I inſiſt, and chiefly rely upon, as a juſt Anſwer unto the Argument grounded on St. *Clement's* Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* is this, that 'tis drawn only from a Negative, *Clement's* not expreſly mentioning the three diſtinct Orders, which I contend is unconcluding. I have oft enough produced Inſtances out of Scripture, of the Apoſtle's not conſtantly remembring all the Church-Officers in their Epiſtles, and frequently mentioning none at all. To keep my ſelf within the Compaſs of my preſent Province, the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, *Ignatius*, whoſe great Deſign in all his other Epiſtles was to aſſert, and vindicate the three Orders of Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, paſſes 'em all over in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*. But 'tis no good Conſequence that therefore the Church of *Rome*, had not in it ſo much as a Presbyter or a Deacon. It may farther be conſidered, that much more an Argument deduced from an Author's ſilence can be of no force, when there are other poſitive, and expreſs Witneſſes atteſting the Truth brought into Queſtion. If a Witneſs depoſes, that *John* and *Richard*, were engaged in the Murder of *Robert*, this ſhall not quit *Thomas*, if another Witneſs ſwears he alſo had an hand in the Aſſaſſination. *Clement* mentions Biſhops (or Presbyters) and Deacons, not ſo much as intimating, that there was a Prelate at *Corinth* (let that now be ſuppoſed:) But his Contemporary *Ignatius*, has again and again teſtify'd that there were Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons in ſeveral Churches, to which he wrote, and particularly in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, that there were theſe three diſtinct Officers, throughout the World as far as he knew, and by conſequence at *Corinth*; Though *Clement*, for Reaſons beſt known unto himſelf, thought not fit to mention the Prelate. Nor can it with Reaſon be pleaded, that *Ignatius* was ignorant of the Government of this Apoſtolical Church of *Corinth*, as I ſuppoſe it will be granted. From the whole then I gather that *Clement's* Silence is no good proof, that there was no Prelatical Biſhop at *Corinth*, becauſe his Contemporary is poſitive there was; which now brings me to the Teſtimony of *Ignatius* in this Controverſy.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Ignatius *his Teſtimony.*

IGnatius, *Clement's* Contemporary, the Diſciple and Friend of St. *John* the Apoſtle, and Martyr of Jeſus Chriſt, has ſo plainly, ſo fully, and ſo often in his Epiſtles, given in his Teſtimony unto the three diſtinct Orders of Church-Officers, Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons: and I have ſo exactly, and at length cited his Words in *T. N. p.* 59. 60, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72 and 73. that one might juſtly wonder, this Truth ſhould any longer be called into Queſtion, after ſo clear Evidence produced. Mr. *O.* has ſundry things to throw in our way, which I muſt conſider in their Order, and remove, if it be poſſible.

Def. p. 110. 1. Mr. *O.* would bring the credit of theſe Epiſtles into ſuſpicion, as if it were not agreed among the Learned, whether they are Genuine, " That *Daille* endeavoured to prove 'em Spurious, " and *La Roque* with great Judgment, reply'd unto the Learned Bp. of *Cheſter*, Dr. " *Pearſon*, who had endeavoured to confute Monſieur *Daille*, in his *Vindiciæ E-* " *piſt.* S. *Ignatii.*

Anſ. The Genuineneſs of theſe Epiſtles was never queſtioned by any Learned Man, that I know of, ſince Dr. *Pearſon* publiſhed his vindication of 'em, ſave by Monſieur *La Roque*, who attempted to ſupport Monſieur *Daille* but without ſucceſs. I never heard he gained any one Proſelyte. 'Tis confeſſed, I have not read that *French* Gentleman's Book, the Reaſon whereof is, that when Dr. *Pearſon* was by his Friends dealt with to make a Reply to *La Roque*, the Wiſe Man anſwered, *There was no need of it, that* La Roque *had advanced nothing of Moment againſt his* Vindiciæ, *and that the Authority of* St. Ignatius's *Epiſtles remained ſtill unqueſtionable.* This I remember very well was the common Diſcourſe among us many Years ago, in the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, and the Event confirms it: no Body now daring to deny them, not the Diſſenters themſelves, though ſometimes in general they would have 'em paſs for uncertain. It's not intended hereby to diſparage Monſieur *La Roque* in the leaſt. His Misfortune was, that, He undertook the Defence of an ill Cauſe againſt a Potent Adverſary, in ſuch a Caſe the Learned'ſt Man in the World, muſt be forced to retire with diſhonour and diſappointment. But for Mr. *O.* to ſay that, *'Twas not agreed among the Learned*, &c. when one only Learned Man is to be found that ſtands out, is too much (I think) to offer unto the World, as if the Balance were even, and the Learned equally divided about the Genuineneſs of *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles. I am perſwaded Mr. *O.* himſelf believes, what Biſhop *Pearſon* has proved 'em to be, though he would inſinuate that they are yet doubtful: But enough of this.

Plea, p. 29. 2. Mr. *O.* further contends, " There are ſtrong preſump- " tions, that the Church of *Epheſus* conſiſted of no more Members " than could Ordinarily meet in one place, and had but one Altar, at which " the

"the Congregation Ordinarily received the Lord's-Supper. *Def. ubi ſupra.*
" And again, that *Ignatius*'s Biſhop was but the Chief Paſtor
" of a Church, which Ordinarily aſſembled together for Perſonal Communion;
" that the Biſhop's Diooceſs in *Ignatius*'s time, and long after, exceeded not the
" Bounds of a Modern Pariſh. Finally (up and down in the *Defence*) that as
" the Presbyters could do nothing without the Biſhops, ſo neither could the Bi-
" ſhops without their Presbytery, which is an Argument of their Parity, and
" that (as elſewhere he, and generally all other *Diſſenters* make *Ignatius*'s Biſhops)
" they were but the Moderators in the Presbyteries, and thoſe not for Life nei-
" ther but temporary only, as many of them have affirmed.

Anſ. The Preſumptions Mr. *O.* means are thoſe He ſpeaks of in his *Plea* and *Defence*, as I ſuppoſe, grounded upon ſome ſlight Paſſages in the Epiſtles, as ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, ἐν θυσιαστηρίῳ, κατ' ἄνδρα, ἐξ ὀνόματος, and ſuch like, of which enough has already been ſaid, unleſs their ſenſe could be more certainly determined. For He and I may talk and diſpute till Dooms-Days, that thus, or thus thoſe Phraſes may or ought to ſignifie, and at laſt leave the Matter as we found it, undecided, and every Man to chooſe what ſenſe he pleaſes, as his Intereſt ſways him, or as his Affections and adherence to a Cauſe ſhall Byaſs him. Letting then theſe things paſs; the Anſwer which I make, ſhall be to lay before the Reader ſome Reaſons, as will I hope evince the Truth, and prevail with him, to embrace the ſenſe of this Father, which we have already given, and to believe that *Ignatius* his Biſhops were truly Prelatical and Dioceſan. And,

1. Were it as Mr. *O.* affirms, yet the Diſſenters are Univerſally departed even from this Form of Church Government. What one Congregation among 'em has its Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, and the Biſhop the Supreme Manager without whom nothing ought to be done? But

2. Whereas he tells us, that *Ignatius* his Biſhop was but the chief Paſtor of a Church, that is the Moderator of the Presbytery, this cannot be, if we will allow *Ignatius* to have been a Man of common Senſe and Underſtanding. For what more abſurd and impertinent, could have been written than all along in theſe ſeven Epiſtles, to diſtinguiſh ſo carefully between the Biſhop, and his Presbyters, and yet all the while the Biſhop, was but one of the Presbyters, ſet up only to Moderate in their Presbyteries, and debates for Orders ſake? Or how could *Ignatius* direct, (as Mr. *O.* pleads) that the Preſbyters, ſhould do nothing without the Biſhop, nor the Biſhop without the Preſbyters, except he thought the Biſhop a diſtinct Species of Officer from the Preſbyters, and the Preſbyters from the Biſhop? The Biſhop then, and the Preſbyter muſt needs be two different Orders, in *Ignatius*'s Opinion.

It is objected, that ſince the Obligation was reciprocal, *i.e.* the Biſhop could do nothing without the Preſbyters, as the Preſbyters could not Act without the Biſhop, the Biſhop therefore had no preheminence above the Preſbyters. I anſwer,

1. That however the Biſhop muſt be allowed to have been more than an Ordinary Presbyter, yea at leaſt equal to the whole Presbytery, and to have himſelf made a diſtinct Order from it, (the very Reciprocal Obligation here objected of neceſſity implies as much).

2. Not

2. Not only ſo, but as the King is the Supreme Monarch of this Nation, and more than the Lords or Commons, though He can enact no Law without the Parliament, as the Parliament cannot without him; as the King, I ſay, makes a diſtinct State of the Realm (this I think Mr. *O.* will grant) ſo was *Ignatius* his Biſhop, an Officer different from the Presbyters (if the Father ſpake Senſe in his Epiſtle) and Superior to them.

If it be enquired, wherein could his Supremacy conſiſt? I reply, that after any Laws and Conſtitutions were reſolved on, between the Biſhop and the Presbytery, or whatever was known to have been ordained by the Apoſtles, he had the care and overſight to ſee 'em executed, and in matters of greateſt moment, he generally was the executor of 'em himſelf in Perſon, as the King is in the Secular Affairs of this Nation. For as the King does nothing, that is, makes no New Laws without the Parliament, yet he ſees to the Execution of 'em after they are once made, and of all other the ancient Laws of the Realm, and that without the Parliament: ſo the Biſhop though he did nothing, that is made no New Conſtitutions without the Presbytery, yet 'twas he who had the care of their Execution, and of the more Ancient, and Apoſtolical Decrees and Traditions. It muſt neceſſarily have been ſo, if *Ignatius* his Epiſtles carry any Senſe in them.

But perhaps a poſitive proof of all this will be demanded from me out of the Epiſtles. To this purpoſe, then obſerve,

1. What *Ignatius* writes to the *Epheſians*——*Whom the Maſter* (Jeſus Chriſt) *ſends unto the Adminiſtration of his own Houſhold* (the Church) *we ought ſo to receive him as we would receive the Maſter that ſent him. 'Tis then manifeſt we ought to look upon the Biſhop, as we ought to look upon the Lord* (Jeſus Chriſt). Here it appears, that *Ignatius* accounted the Biſhop to be *οἰκονόμος* the Adminiſtrator of the Church or Houſhold.

2. That though *Ignatius* exhorts the Churches to be ſubject to, and obey the Biſhop and the Presbyters alſo, (And ſo He does to the Deacons too, in the Epiſtles to the *Trallians*, *Philadelphians*, and *Smyrneans*); yet he never thus preſcribes Obedience to the Presbyters, or the Presbyteries only, or without mentioning the Biſhop with and before 'em. But he frequently admoniſhes the Church to obey the Biſhop without expreſs mention of the Presbyters.

3. That though He adviſes the Church to be ſubject unto the Biſhop and Presbytery (and to the Deacons alſo), yet he never adviſes them expreſly to *do nothing without the Presbyters*, or Presbytery. Beſides, Mr. *O*'s ſaying that the Biſhop could do nothing without the Presbyters, is without ground in theſe Epiſtles, it being never ſaid, *Do nothing without the Biſhop and the Presbytery*, much leſs ſimply, *Do nothing without the Presbyters*.

Voſſ. Edit. p. 31. 4. 'Tis not to be forgotten, what *Ignatius* takes ſpecial notice of in his Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*—*You muſt not abuſe or deſpiſe the Youth of our Biſhop* (Demas), *but pay him all Reverence, as I know the Holy Presbyters do, who look on the Ordinance* (the Biſhop as I take it, or the Epiſcopacy) *not as a new Device; but as Wiſe Men they ſubmit unto him in the Lord*, or as the Inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt. So then the Presbyters were ſubject and obedient to the Biſhop. But where will it be found, that the Biſhop is admoniſhed or adviſed to obey the Presbyters?

5. When

5. When *Ignatius* was in Bonds raviſhed from his People, or Church, H thus writes to the *Romans*———*Which* (the Church in *Syria*) *in my ſtead now has the Lord only for its Shepherd.* But though the Church of *Syria* had loſt its Biſhop, and was then at preſent without one, yet ſurely they had not loſt all their Preſbyters. And if the Church of *Syria* retained yet her Preſbyters, as by the quiet that Church even then had muſt be thought, they might eaſily have made to themſelves a Chief Paſtor or Moderator, out of their remaining Number, and not been deſtitute of a Shepherd (as *Ignatius* bewails) whoſe loſs or abſence at preſent, could only be ſupply'd by the chief Shepherd and Biſhop of their Souls. Here by the way, the conceit of a temporary Moderator, muſt be thrown out of Doors. *Ignatius* was Biſhop of *Syria* for life: nor could they have another whilſt He was living, tho' abſent in Bonds. This was the Reaſon, he ſo Paſſionately reſented the unhappineſs of that Church of *Syria*, that they were forced to be without a Biſhop, which they needed not to have been, if another chief Paſtor and Moderator might have been conſtituted in his abſence and Life-time, which by the Preſbyterian Principles might eaſily have been done.

Iſ. Voſſ. Ed. p. 45.

6. *Ignatius* over and over preſcribes, that the Churches ſhould *do nothing without the Biſhop*, and not only ſo in theſe General Terms, (which haply will be underſtood of his preſiding in Preſbyteries, and moderating in their Debates for Order's ſake), but alſo in particular, *that Marriages ſhould not be Celebrated, the Lord's Supper ſhould not be adminiſtred, nor Baptiſm given unto Believers without him*, without his appointment and approbation. This ſhews that *Ignatius* his Biſhop, was not only the Preſident in their Synods and Deliberations, but the Supreme Director of the Execution of the Laws, and Rules of the Church, without whoſe leave the Preſbyters could not Marry, nor Adminiſter the Sacraments. 'Tis all we deſire of the Diſſenters, if we might prevail with 'em, that they would not preſume to do any thing without the Biſhop, and particularly not to Ordain Presbyters. Laſtly, Although he often calls the Presbytery the Council of God, and College of the Apoſtles, yet to keep up the Authority of the Biſhop, He then at the ſame time reſembles him unto God himſelf, or to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. If then God the Father was Superior to the Apoſtles, and if Jeſus Chriſt muſt be confeſt greater than the Council of the Apoſtles, ſo was the Biſhop, than the Preſbyters or Presbytery, in the Opinion of this Father: and according to the Analogy, and Reſemblance in this Author. From the whole 'tis (I hope) clear to a Demonſtration, that *Ignatius* his Biſhops, were more than what Mr. *O.* means by *chief Paſtor*: or Moderator in their Aſſembles *pro tempore*. They were Prelatical, and in the nature of their Office Superior to Presbyters. It remains that we ſhew, they were Dioceſan Biſhops, that is, had the overſight of more than one Congregation; for this is another Objection Mr. *O.* has raiſed againſt our eſtabliſhed Dioceſan Epiſcopacy. For Proof hereof let it be remembred.

Ep. ad Magneſ. ad Trall. & alibi.

1. That if there were not in *Ignatius* his time, *de facto Dioceſan* Biſhops, they were at leaſt formed and deſigned for ſuch, when ever the multitude of Believers ſhould be encreaſed. It has already been obſerved, that *Titus* left by St. *Paul* in *Crete*, to Govern that Church, was particularly directed by the Apoſtle to Ordain Elders in every City, in all, or as many Cities as ſhould afterward

receive the Faith, or in Order to convert more of 'em. I gather hence that *Titus* was intended to be the Ruler of all theſe Congregations. Let Mr. *O.* make him a Biſhop, or an Archbiſhop, 'tis all one to me; he was conſtituted to be Ruler over many Cities and Congregations. Thus at leaſt it was (I conceive) in theſe *Aſiatick* Churches to whom *Ignatius* wrote, as will hence appear, *viz.* that every of theſe Churches was furniſhed with a Prelatical Biſhop, with Presbyters and Deacons under him. To what purpoſe elſe ſo many Presbyters, and ſuch diſtinct kinds of Orders? One or two at moſt might have ſufficed 'em at preſent, eſpecially if it be conſidered, that the Chriſtians at that time were not in ſo flouriſhing a condition, as to be able to maintain ſo many Church Officers for one Congregation; nor was there buſineſs enough to employ 'em all in the ſervice of that one Congregation. 'Tis then moſt rational to believe, that ſo many Presbyters and Deacons, were provided at leaſt for carrying on the Converſion of the Infidels, and multiplying them into ſeveral Congregations. But if every Congregation, muſt have had or was, intended to have a Biſhop, we ſhould doubtleſs have read of Biſhops, *ex. gr.* at *Epheſus*, as well as Presbyters in the Plural. Let us then ſuppoſe what is moſt reaſonable to admit, that ſome at leaſt of theſe Churches had been in *Ignatius*'s time, multiply'd into ſeveral Congregations, yet ſtill there was but one Biſhop. I do not remember that ever we read of two Biſhops, of any one City in all Antiquity, excepting when the Chriſtians of that City were harraſſed and diſturbed, with Schiſms and Diviſions. Now who can imagin, that no one City in the World, even in *Ignatius*'s time, ever had more Believers in and near it, than did Aſſemble for Divine Worſhip in one place? Eſpecially in thoſe times of Perſecution, when the Chriſtians ſkulked, and could not with ſafety meet in great numbers, nor had Rooms capacious enough, and therefore cantoned themſelves into ſeveral Meetings. Let any one put all theſe things together, and impartially weigh them, and he will not eaſily grant that Paradox, that there was no more than one ſingle Congregation in any City; nor will he make any ſcruple to believe that *Ignatius*'s Biſhop, was at leaſt deſigned to preſide over ſeveral Presbyters and Congregations. Laſtly, the Negative that there was but one Congregation in any of 'em has not been proved, neither can by any expreſs Teſtimony. I conceive it behoves our Diſſenters, to make this out before they can throughly juſtifie their Congregational Churches. But let us now come to particulars, and therefore.

Pliny his contemporary Witneſſeth, *That* Chriſtianity had not only over-run City and Country, but had infected many of every Sex, Age and Order of Men. *Plin. l.* 10. *E.* 97.

2. Note, that *Ignatius* ſtiles himſelf Biſhop of *Syria*, in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*. Now how large a tract *Syria* contained, I need not ſay, neither will I affirm he was Biſhop of all *Syria*, taken in its utmoſt Latitude. But ſeeing he calls himſelf, and was Biſhop of *Syria*, 'twas more than of the bare City *Antioch*, as any one will confeſs. His Epiſcopal Power muſt have extended unto ſome conſiderable compaſs of Ground, in the adjacent parts of the Country, elſe it had been fooliſh to have pretended himſelf, to be the Biſhop of *Syria*, when he was only Biſhop of *Antioch*, and of one Congregation there. Will any one then ſuffer himſelf to believe *Ignatius* was Biſhop but of one Congregation only? It cannot enter into my head ſo much as to think it poſſible: becauſe it muſt be ſup-

poſed

poſed there were Congregations in *Syria* as well as at *Antioch*: in Country as well as City.

3. I reckon alſo that the Church of *Epheſus*, conſiſted of more than one Congregation, and my Reaſons are

1. As I argued in *T. N.* p. 145. from *Act.* 19. 10. That the Church of *Epheſus* took in all *Aſia*——*All they of* Aſia *heard the Word of the Lord Jeſus*, from the mouth of *Paul*, who then reſided at *Epheſus*, and there Preached the Goſpel firſt in the Synagogue (*v.* 8.) then in the School of *Tyrannus* (*v.* 9.). *Aſia*, I expounded *Aſia* the Proper: but I would crave leave a little to mend that Gloſs, underſtanding it only of ſome of the nearer parts of it, adjoining unto *Epheſus*, which belonged unto *Aſia* the Proper. And wheras the Hiſtorian expreſſes Himſelf thus largely *all Aſia*, and yet intends (as I ſuppoſe only the Neighbouring parts of it, we need not much admire at this, ſince it is ſo ſaid to aggrandize and Magnify the ſucceſs, and Increaſe of the Goſpel. We have an Inſtance of this kind of expreſſion in the Chapter before us, *Act.* 19. 27. where the mad and ſuperſtitious People of *Epheſus* Glory of their Goddeſs *Diana*, *that all* Aſia, *and the World Worſhippeth Her*: and yet, *v.* 34. ſhe is called *Diana of the Epheſians*; at leaſt ſhe was not Worſhipped all the World over ſtrictly ſpeaking. So I read *Jo.* 12. 19. *Behold the World is gone after him*; and yet only ſome Numbers of the Jews followed Chriſt. In ſhort, by *all Aſia*, is to be underſtood the *Epheſian Aſia*, or that part which adjoined pretty cloſe unto *Epheſus*, whither their ſecular buſineſs oft drew the Country People: Their Curioſity firſt lead them unto the Synagogue and School of *Tyrannus*, and ſo they became Acquainted with the Word of the Lord Jeſus and embraced it, of theſe Country Converts we read in this Chapter, *v.* 31——*And certain of the chief of* Aſia, *which were his Friends ſent unto him*, &c. Nor is it an unuſual thing to call the parts of a Country, near unto the Principal City by the general Name of the Province, whereof it is but a little Member. Thus (as is before obſerved) *Ignatius* ſtiles Himſelf Biſhop of *Syria*; not of all *Syria*, properly ſo called, as will I hope be granted me, but of the Country round about *Antioch*, which was within the limits of *Syria*. So then if all they which dwelt in *Aſia*, in the Adjacent parts of *Epheſus*, as well as in the City its ſelf, heard the Word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks, *v.* 10. and this within the ſpace of thoſe two Years, the Apoſtle remained at *Epheſus*, it muſt be allowed that the Church of *Epheſus* was too numerous to be contained within one Single Congregation; and it is reaſonable to believe, that there were ſome Congregations in the Country (eſpecially in *Ignatius*'s time) which the Presbyters of *Epheſus*, in Ordinary, attended under the Biſhop. If it be doubted whether theſe Country Proſelytes, or theſe Country Congregations, were Members of the Church of *Epheſus*, ſome Reaſons or Evidences to the contrary muſt be aſſigned. We read no where of any Prelatical Church (which muſt be confeſſed, the Form of Church Government thereabouts in *Ignatius*'s Time) nearer *Epheſus*, than that at *Magneſia*, diſtant from *Epheſus* about fourſcore Miles. But that the Country Presbyters and Congregations within the foreſaid Tract, did belong unto *Epheſus* is moſt probable hence, that the Scripture all along ſpeaks of the Church of *Epheſus* and of *Aſia*, as one and the ſame Church: *Acts* 20. 18. *Ye know* (ſays He to the *Epheſian* Elders) *after what manner I have been with you from the firſt day, that I came into* Aſia. Acts 19. 31. *Certain of the chief of* Aſia. 2 Cor. 1. 8. We

would not (Brethren) have you ignorant of our trouble, which came to us in Aſia. Acts 20. 16. Paul *determined to ſail by* Epheſus, *becauſe He would not ſpend the time in* Aſia. Theſe expreſſions could never have dropt from the Holy Pen-Men, except the Church of *Epheſus* had extended its ſelf, round about in the Country of *Aſia*. We read oft times that when St. *Paul* ſpeaks of the Affairs of *Corinth*, He uſes the Word *Achaia* (whereof *Corinth* was the Principal City. *Rom.* 15. 26, 16. 6. 1 *Cor.* 16. 15. 2 *Cor.* 9. 2. 1 *Theſ.* 1. 7.) Which is an Evidence, that the Church of *Corinth* comprehended a good part of *Achaia*. From the whole I gather there muſt needs have been ſeveral Congregations, belonging to the Church of *Epheſus*, even in St. *Paul's* days, much more in the days of *Ignatius*, and if ſo, then *Oneſimus* was a Dioceſan Biſhop of *Epheſus*.

T. N. p. 139. 140, 141. But Secondly. I alſo pretended to evince by an Heap of Arguments collected from the Form of Church Government, drawn up by the Aſſembly of Divines, and Vindicated by the *London* Miniſters after in their *Jus Divinum Miniſterii Anglicani*, that in St. *Paul's* Time, there were ſeveral Congregations in the Church of *Epheſus*: Mr. *O.* who tells his Reader ſomewhere in his Defence, that He has followed and Anſwered me Paragraph by Paragraph, has made a ſhift to skip over theſe Proofs: They come too near the Quick. I ſhall be forced therefore for that Reaſon, and the more ſtrongly to Eſtabliſh my Poſition to repeat them once more, and ſo diſmiſs the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*. The Aſſembly, and the *London* Divines, undertook to evince by Scripture, that even in the Days of St. *Paul*, there were ſeveral Congregations in the Church of *Epheſus*, and argued as follows——"The Number of Prophets and Teachers at "*Epheſus* were many, *Paul* continued there two Years and three Months, ſettled "thereabout twelve Diſciples, who Propheſied *Act.* 19. 1. 6, 7. How ſhould "theſe thirteen Miniſters be employ'd, if there were not many Congregations? "compare alſo *Act.* 20. 17, 18, 36, 37. where 'tis ſaid of the Biſhops (*or Presbyters*) of *Epheſus*, that *Paul* kneeled down and prayed with them all, and "they all wept ſore. Here is a good number imply'd. The gift of Tongues, "alſo was given unto all theſe twelve Prophets, *Act.* 19. 6, 7. To what end, if "they had not ſeveral Congregations to ſpeak unto in theſe ſeveral Tongues? "The multitude of believers muſt needs be great at *Epheſus*. For firſt, why ſhould "*Paul*, who had Univerſal Commiſſion to plant Churches in all the World, "ſtay about two Years at *Epheſus*, if no more had been converted there, than "to make up one ſingle Congregation? *Act.* 19. 8, 10. During this ſpace (ſecondly) "all *that dwelt in* Aſia (uſually Meeting at *Epheſus* for Worſhip) heard the "Word of the Lord Jeſus, both Jews and Greeks. *Act.* 19. 10. At the knowledge of *Paul's* Miracles (thirdly) Fear fell upon all *the Jews* and Greeks, dwelling at *Epheſus*, and the Name of the Lord Jeſus was magnified, *Act.* 19. 17. "*Many* of the believers (fourthly) came, and confeſſed and ſhewed their deeds, *v.* "18. whereby is intimated, that more did believe than did thus, (fifthly) *Many* "alſo of them that uſed curious Arts, brought their Books together and burnt "them before all Men, and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thouſand pieces of Silver. (This they would never have done publickly, if the "Major part, or at leaſt a very great and conſiderable part of the City, had not "embraced the Faith, that City being ſo furiouſly zealous in their Superſtition and "Idolatry). *So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed*, Act. 19. 19, 20. *Paul* "teſtifies

"teſtifies (ſixthly) that at *Epheſus* a great Door, and Effectual was opened unto "Him, *viz.* a moſt advantagious opportunity of bringing in a mighty Harveſt "of Souls to Chriſt. 1 *Cor.* 16. 8, 9. Put all theſe together, how is it poſſible "to imagine upon any ſolid ground, that there were no more than one ſingle "Congregation in the Church of *Epheſus*? Theſe are the Aſſemblies, and *London* Miniſters Arguments, which Mr. *O.* may do well at his leiſure to confute if He can. If He can't, and as I am apt to ſuſpect will not endeavour, then my point is gained. For if even in *Paul*'s days, there were many Congregations in the Church of *Epheſus*, then much more in the times of *Ignatius*, the Chriſtian Religion doubtleſs getting ground continually in thoſe parts upon the *Gentile* Superſtition, as is manifeſt afterwards from the Churches hereabouts planted, and mentioned in the Revelations; to which may be added *Magneſia* and *Trallis* out of *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, none of which are to be found in the ſtory of St. *Paul*, except *Laodicea*, that I can remember. Now I will not contend that, every of the Churches ſpoken of in *Ignatius* was actually Dioceſan, not knowing how early they were planted. But thus much I repeat again, they were intended to be caſt into the ſame Model as *Epheſus* was, as many be gathered from the Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons fixt in them, which was, as I may ſay, the Foundation of larger Churches to conſiſt of many Congregations, after more believers, ſhould by the Grace of God, be added unto the Churches.

By this time (I am in ſome Hopes) 'tis undeniably proved, 1. That the Biſhops of thoſe Churches, to whom *Ignatius* wrote, were Prelatical, that is, were of a Diſtinct ſpecies of Church-Officers, and Superior to the Presbyters, who were ſubject to them. 2. That they were likewiſe Dioceſan, that is, Rulers over ſeveral Congregations, and over the Presbyters and Deacons, who Ordinarily Miniſtred in them, from whence it muſt be concluded that the ſeveral Paſſages, of whoſe Senſe Mr. *O.* and I have diſputed, muſt be ſo expounded as to be made agreeable to Prelatical and Dioceſan Epiſcopacy. Whether I have done it, is left to the Judgment of the Reader, if He pleaſe to conſult the *I. N.* To ſpeak only of the ἓν θυσιαστήριον one Altar, very briefly, becauſe He alledges the Teſtimony, of no leſs a Man, than the Famous Mr. *Mede*, for one Numerical Altar, and not a Specifical one, as I expounded it.

Thoſe Words in *Ignatius*'s Epiſtle, *Ad Magneſ.* ἓν θυσιαστήριον are thought to favour one Numerical Altar, which Mr. *O.* contends for, of which thus Mr. *Mede* delivers Himſelf——"Here is a "Temple with an Altar in it: For in theſe Primitive Times "they had but one Altar in a Church. *B.* 2. p. 414.

Anſ. No more have we at this day. Though we have many Churches in a Dioceſs, yet every Church has an Altar, and but one: and ſo it might be at *Magneſia*, for any thing that is yet ſaid to the contrary. But

Mr. *Mede* goes on——"It ſhould ſeem they had but one Altar to a Church, "taking Church for the Company or Corporation, of the Faithful United un-"der one Biſhop, in the City or place where the Biſhop had his See or Reſidence; "as the Jews had one Temple, and one Altar for the Whole Nation, United "under one High-Prieſt. The Author endeavours to confirm this (as Mr. *O.* truly ſays) out of *Juſtin* Martyr, and St. *Cyprian*.

Anſ.

Anſ. But ſtill Mr. *O.* miſrepreſents Mr. *Mede*, as if He were poſitive herein, which is not ſo. For 1. Mr. *Mede* lays down his poſition very cautiouſly—*It ſhould ſeem*: intimating, it was not very clear from thoſe Words of *Ignatius*, [illegible]; for theſe Words many imply only, that every Temple had but one Altar, as it is with us, and yet there might be more Temples than one in the Biſhop's Churches, and therefore more Altars. 2. Mr. *Mede* at the ſame time, thinketh the Biſhop's Churches to have been Dioceſan: For though they had not ſeveral Altars, yet they had ſeveral Oratories or leſſer Temples (ſays He) as the Jews had their Synagogues. So that the one Numerical Altar in the Biſhop's Church, does not prove his Church to conſiſt of one Congregation only in this Learned Gentleman's Opinion; no more than the one Altar in the Temple of the Jews, proves there were no Synagogues. 3. Mr. *Mede* to back his Conjecture, grounded on *Ignatius*, produces two Teſtimonies, the one out of *Juſtin*, the other out of *Cyprian*; and becauſe he is not poſitive or certain of the Concluſion he draws from them, it will be no breach of Modeſty, if I examine whether Mr. *Mede* has well grounded his Conjecture on thoſe two Fathers.

Juſtin Martyr in his ſecond Apology thus writes——*All that live in Cities or Countries*, (*πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς* plural) *meet together* (*ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*) *in one place* (ſo Mr. *Mede*) *to Celebrate the Holy Euchariſt*. This Paſſage does not evince that the Biſhop's Church taken for the whole Company of Believers united under him had but one Altar, for which I offer the following Reaſons, *Firſt*, Becauſe *Juſtin* here intends not to give the *Gentiles* an Account of the Polity, and Government of the Chriſtian Churches; nor how many ſort of Church-Officers there were among them, nor how many Congregations under one Biſhop, but of the manner of their Divine Worſhip, and that not in one ſingle Congregation, but in all; His meaning is that in all Towns and Countries throughout the World, the Chriſtians belonging to any one Congregation, or certain diſtrict met together, &c. For all this there might be ſeveral Congregations under One Biſhop. If I for example ſhould write to a Foreigner, concerning the manner of our Worſhip here in *England*, not intermedling with the Nature of our Government, might I not, ought I not to ſay? All that live in Towns or Countries (or where-ever there is a Congregation) meet together in one place, though at the ſame time there be many Churches, and many Congregations, united under one Biſhop of the Dioceſs, which thus meet together for Divine Worſhip? *Secondly*, Whereas *Juſtin* mentions the *προεστὼς* the Preſident, who Celebrates the Divine Worſhip in theſe ſingle Congregations, there is no neceſſity of Underſtanding Him, ſpeaking of the Biſhop only. He may uſing one common Title for both, ſpeak of the Presbyters, who preſide over the Divine Worſhip in their particular Congregations. So Mr. *Mede* expounds *Antiſtes* afterward; not the Biſhop only, but the Biſhop or Presbyter, that is, He who Miniſters in the Congregation at that time. *Thirdly*, Suppoſing He means the Biſhop, He does but inſtance in, and exemplify the Chriſtian Worſhip, by the moſt Honourable Aſſembly, *ſc.* that, wherein the Biſhop himſelf Ordinarily Preſided in Perſon, not excluding others, wherein the Presbyters Miniſtred. *Fourthly*, *Juſtin*, becauſe he writes in the Plural *Towns* and *Countries*, and of Chriſtian Worſhip in General, or indefinitely muſt here intend all Chriſtian Aſſemblies in the World: And therefore it may as well hence be concluded,

cluded, that there was but one Numerical Congregation or Altar in the World, as that there was but one in the Biſhop's Church. Upon the whole matter, the Point is no manner of way proved from *Juſtin* Martyr.

As for St. *Cyprian*, who condemns *the ſetting up Altar againſt Altar*, it can't thence be gathered, that a Dioceſan Biſhop had but one Numerical Altar. What this Father blames, is ſetting up an Altar againſt the Biſhop's Altar, in oppoſition to it, not in Subordination to and Communion with it. It is true here what our Lord ſpake on another occaſion, *He that is not againſt the Biſhop, is for him*, and *He that is not with the Biſhop, is againſt Him*. In St. *Cyprian*'s Time, there were ſeveral, not Oratories only, but *Baſilicæ* ſtately, and magnificent Churches in the ſame Cities, and within the Limits of one Biſhop's Juriſdiction. So *Optatus Milevitanus* relates—[illegible] *poſt Perſecutionem apud Cirtam, quia Baſilicæ needum fuerant reſtitutæ, in Domum Urbani Carſi conſederunt, &c.* *Many Traditors* (afterward turning Donatiſt Biſhops) *met in the Houſe of Urbanus Carſus*, after the Perſecution at Cirta, *becauſe the Temples were not yet reſtored*, &c. Now *Cirta* was an Epiſcopal See in *Cyprian*'s Time, and *Creſcens* was Biſhop of it †, and the Perſecution here ſpoken of was that of *Diocleſian*, wherein theſe Temples were taken away from the Chriſtians. They muſt then have been built before that Emperor's time. It follows hence, that at *Cirta* the Chriſtians had ſeveral Churches before *Diocleſian* Reigned, that is not long after *Cyprian*, even in the Third Age; therefore there were in the *Cyprianic* Age, ſeveral Congregations in the ſame City, and Epiſcopal Church, and conſequently ſeveral Altars. For no Man can think that among theſe *Baſilicæ* theſe Magnificent Churches, that one only had an Altar. And ſo from the whole it may be gathered, that the erecting Altar againſt Altar, condemned by *Cyprian*, was not the erecting more Numerical Altars than one in an Epiſcopal Church, but erecting them, or any one of them in Oppoſition to the Biſhop. This Father then does not favour Mr. *Mede*'s Conjecture at all.

Ed. Mer. Caſaub. Lond. 1631. l. 1. p. 16.

† Con. Cart. ap. Cyp. Tract. de Bap. Hær. p. 23[illegible]. Ed. Ox.

The Premiſes duly conſidered, I think *Ignatius*'s ἓν θυσιαστήριον one Altar was rightly interpreted by me; ſince it is made ſo manifeſt, that his Biſhop was both Prelatical and Dioceſan. I need not then trouble my ſelf any further, about the meaning of the other ſlight Paſſages objected to me out of that Father, ſince they muſt all ſome way or other be reconciled with this Hypotheſis, and I hope I was not very wide of the Truth in the *Tentamen Novum*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of St. Mark *the Evangeliſt, Founder of the Church of* Alexandria.

I Having produced the teſtimony of *Euſebius* (*Hiſt. lib.* 2. *ch.* 16, 17.) in proof of a multitude of Chriſtians at *Alexandria*, about the time that *Philo* the Jew wrote his Treatiſe, *de vita Contemplativa*, which was in the Days of *Claudius* the Emperor, or beginning of *Nero's* Reign, near fifty Years after Chriſt, Mr. *O.* excepts againſt the Teſtimony as follows——

Def. p. 18. "That this Paſſage of *Euſebius*, overthrows the notion of the "Learned Aſſertors of Epiſcopacy, *that a Dioceſs is the* "*loweſt Species of a Church*: that *Euſebius* ſpeaks of Churches *in the plural*: that "therefore there muſt be Biſhops *of Alexandria*, and not one Biſhop only: that "*Mark* was an Evangeliſt, that is, *an extraordinary Officer* in that Church: that "*Annianus*, *Mark's* Succeſſor was not a Biſhop of a Superiour Order, but an "Honourable Preſident in their Aſſemblies, and a Moderator in their Synods, "without Power of Juriſdiction over his Collegues.

Anſ. I am not concerned in the private Opinions of Modern Authors, who aſſert a *Dioceſs to be the loweſt Species of a Church*: nor will I trouble my ſelf to ſhew how they limit their Notion, and explain themſelves in that point, nor whether Mr. *O.* fairly deduces his conſequence from that Paſſage of *Euſebius*, *that therefore there muſt be Biſhops, not one Biſhop only of* Alexandria. Let the Aſſertors of this Notion ſee to it, Mr. *O's* Reaſoning, ſuch as it is, affects not me nor my Hypotheſis, it being my firm perſwaſion, that a ſingle Congregation as well as Dioceſs, is even in Scripture called a Church. Only let it be obſerved, Mr. *O.* grants, that there were according to *Euſebius*, ſeveral Churches or Congregations in *Alexandria*, but how He will evince there were ſeveral Biſhops there, I am yet to ſeek. 'Tis moreover ſuppoſed, that *Mark* was an Evangeliſt (or an Extraordinary Officer): And what then, ſtill *Annianus* an Ordinary one might ſucceed him, in the Ordinary Office of Governing a Dioceſan Church. *See Part the firſt, Chapter the fifth.* And tho' *Mark* was an Evangeliſt (an Extraordinary Officer) which Mr. *O.* muſt confeſs, and had Power over all the Presbyters there, yet (ſays Mr. *O.*) *Annianus* was not a Biſhop of a Superior Order, with Power of Juriſdiction over his Collegues, but an Honourable Preſident or Moderator in the Synods. But this is only Mr. *O's* ſingular conceit; we are in the preſent Controverſy to be guided by what *Euſebius* tells us, that Annianus *ſucceeded* Mark, *in the Adminiſtration of the Church of* Alexandria. Can any one underſtand leſs thereby, than that *Annianus* received the ſame, and all the Power of Juriſdiction, that *Mark* had? In ſhort, I cannot diſcern Mr. *O.* has advanc'd any thing againſt me, or laid his own ſentiments ſo cloſe together, as to be conſiſtent with themſelves.

Euſ. E.H. Lib. 2. Ch. 24.

But

But Mr. *O.* farther objects——"That *Philo* wrote of the *Eſſenes*, a *Jewiſh* "*Sect*, and not of the Chriſtians, as the Learned have proved againſt "*Euſebius.*

Anſ. 'Tis true, many Learned Men have deny'd the *Therapeutæ* (ſo *Euſebius* calls the Religious ſpoken of, in this 17th Chapter, and not *Eſſenes*) to have been Chriſtians: but I find two Queſtions ſtarted concerning them, and will here be bold to ſhoot my Bolt upon both. The firſt Queſtion is, whether theſe *Therapeutæ* were *Eſſenes*. The ſecond, whether they were Chriſtians: for as for thoſe, who have thought them Monks, they deſerve little regard, ſeeing Monkery crept into the Church, not till the Fourth Century. *Socrat. l.* 3. *c.* 13.

As to the firſt, whether the *Therapeutæ* in *Euſebius* were *Eſſenes*, Mr. *Fuller* has determined it in the Affirmative, grounding himſelf upon the ſignification of *Eſſenes*, and *Therapeutæ*, both of them denoting Phyſicians, the former in the *Syriack* Language, the latter in the Greek. And *Godwin*, in his *Moſes* and *Aaron*, from *Scaliger* (as I imagine) divides the *Eſſenes* into two ſorts, the *Practical* and the *Speculative Eſſenes*, which latter were (as he thinks) *Philo's Therapeutæ*, the contrary whereof I am now about to make out from *Valeſius*, who has rendred it unconteſtable, that the *Therapeutæ* could not be *Eſſenes*, and that for the following Reaſons. *Firſt*, Becauſe *Philo* in his Treatiſe, *de vita contemplativa*, not once calls them *Eſſenes*. *Secondly*, the *Eſſenes* were only to be found in *Judea* and *Paleſtine*, as *Philo* elſewhere affirms; but according to him the *Therapeutæ*, were in *Ægypt*, and all the World over. *Thirdly*, *Joſephus* oft ſpeaks of the *Eſſenes*, who followed a practical courſe of Life, but has not one Syllable of the *Therapeutæ*, who betook themſelves wholly to a Contemplative. *Fourthly*, the *Eſſenes* had an Averſion unto Women, but there were Women among the *Therapeutæ*. *Fifthly*, *Photius* plainly diſtinguiſhes the *Therapeutæ* from the *Eſſenes*: and ſo indeed (which I chiefly reſt on) does *Philo* in the very Entrance upon his Treatiſe, *de vita contemplativa*—"Having (*ſays He*) diſcours'd of the *Eſſenes* (who differed "in all things, or to ſpeak more modeſtly in moſt things from the others, I "am now about to Treat of, and affected, and excercis'd a practical Life) I will "now following the courſe of my deſign, ſay, what is fit concerning thoſe, "who have embraced a Contemplative Life, *viz.* the *Therapeutæ.* Can any thing be more plain than that, the *Therapeutæ* were quite another ſort of Men, than were the *Eſſenes* in the Opinion of *Philo*? and He I take it, is the only competent *Judge* in this Controverſy.

Miſcellan. Theol. L. 1. C. 3.

Annot. in Euſ. E. H. p. 32.

Biblioth. ch. 103.

In Lib. *quod omnis probus ſit liber.*

The other Queſtion is, whether the *Therapeutæ* were Chriſtians. Here *Valeſius* takes part with *Scaliger*, againſt *Euſebius* and Argues: *Firſt*, *Philo* deſcribes, the *Therapeutæ* as thoſe who expounded the Law Allegorically. *Secondly*, who made uſe of the Writings of their Old Authors, whereas the Chriſtian Religion, and the Writings of the Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts were but Novel in *Philo*'s time, nor could be eſteemed Ancient. *Thirdly*, who had Prayers but twice a Day, Morning and Evening, but the Chriſtians thrice, as He obſerves

Annot. in Euſeb. H. E. p. 31.

ſerves from the Acts. *Fourthly*, The *Therapeutæ* compoſed Hymns of divers kinds in *Metre*, which the Chriſtians did not till afterwards in the Days of the *Antonini*. *Fifthly*, The *Therapeutæ* ſpread themſelves throughout the World, and were many in *Ægypt*, but the Criſtians few; Whereunto it may be replyed.

Firſt, the Chriſtians expounded the Law Allegorically, as is manifeſt from the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, and ſome Paſſages in St. *Paul's* other Epiſtles; and beſides, though the Jews did endeavour to improve the Law by ſome Allegorical deductions from it, yet they held Primarily unto the Literal ſenſe, and accordingly obſerved the Law; whereas the Chriſtians rejected it in the Literal Senſe, and adhered only to the Allegorical. This then proves the *Therapeutæ* to be Chriſtians, rather than Jews.

Secondly, it muſt be confeſs'd, that the Chriſtian Religion was then New, and the Writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts of a later date; they could not in any reaſon be called Ancient. Nevertheleſs *Philo*, here meant the Writings of the Old Teſtament, which were out of controverſy Ancient, and which the Chriſtians even the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts made frequent uſe of. They may properly enough be called the Chriſtians Ancient Authors. Beſides, tho' *Philo* (this muſt be owned) believed the *Therapeutæ* to be a Sect of the Jews, and becauſe they were converſant in the Writings of the Old Teſtament, thence Collected, that they were of the Jewiſh Religion, yet this is no good Conſequence. It would not paſs (I think) if one ſhould ſay *Timothy* was no Chriſtian, but a Jew, becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, *He knew the Holy Scriptures* (of the Old Teſtament) *which were able to make him wiſe unto Salvation*. *Thirdly*, *Philo* does not affirm the *Therapeutæ* pray'd twice a Day only, but intimates the quite contrary. His Words are, *they paſſed the whole day in exerciſing themſelves*, underſtand, in Prayers, Praiſes, and other Offices of Piety and Devotion. Hence rather it may be gathered that the *Therapeutæ*, pray'd three times a Day, as did the Ancient, and more devout part of the Jews, *Pſal.* 55. 17. *Dan.* 6. 10. *Acts.* 3. 1. as well as the Chriſtians. *Fourthly*, It is no doubt with me, but the Chriſtians compoſed Hymns from the beginning, and 'tis not unlikely in *Metre* too, if ſinging be a good proof of Metrical Praiſes, *Act.* 16. 25. Laſtly the Chriſtians were ſpread throughout the World, as the *Therapeutæ* were: for if (as *Ignatius* teaches) Biſhops were throughout the World, it follows of neceſſity that ſo were the Chriſtians alſo, in as large a Senſe as the *Therapeutæ*. Upon the whole matter here is no proof, that I can ſee of the *Therapeutæ* being Jews, not Criſtians.

Soc. l. 6. c. 8. and *Theod.* l. 2. c. 24. Say *Ignatius* introduced ſinging alternately at *Antioch*.

On the contrary, that they were Chriſtians may be gathered hence, becauſe their Religious Exerciſes, their Lives and Manners, and their Diſcipline were conformable to the Chriſtians, even in things peculiar to the Chriſtians. They divided their Subſtance among their Friends, as the Chriſtians are ſaid to have done in the *Acts*: The Women among them ingaged into a State of Celibacy, which the Jewiſh Women would not do; they obſerved *Lent*, or the Faſt about Good *Friday* more ſtrictly, than at other times; for indeed otherwiſe their whole Life was Abſtinence. In a Word, they had three Orders of Church-Officers: *Firſt*, they that performed [illegible] *λειτουργίας* (that is Presbyters), *Secondly*, they that were employ'd about the *διακονίας* (that is Deacons) and

Thirdly,

Thirdly, thoſe that obtained the higheſt degree of Office amongſt them ([illegible]) that is Biſhops. On theſe and other accounts (which I paſs by) *Euſebius* roundly affirms——*I judge that* Philo's *Words are plainly, and without controverſy to be underſtood of Chriſtians.* Beſides, I cannot eaſily perſwade my ſelf, that *Scaliger* and *Valeſius* at this diſtance of time ſhould ſee further into the matter, than *Euſebius*, *Jerom* and *Epiphanius*, who flouriſh'd much nearer thoſe Days, whereof *Philo* wrote. Nor do we ever read of the *Therapeutæ*, before *Philo* brought them to Light, for any thing I have found; and as for *Joſephus* (who doubtleſs had read *Philo*) he takes no Notice at all of them, 'tis probable, becauſe they were Chriſtians. So that I conceive them, to be as New as the Chriſtians, yea Chriſtians, though *Philo* did not or would not own it, being deſirous (it ſhould ſeem) to commend his own Nation and Religion, by repreſenting the ſtrict Holineſs and Devotion of theſe *Therapeutæ*, as of a Sect of the Jews. Nevertheleſs, we ought here to Remember what *Euſebius*, almoſt in the beginning of the Seventh Chapter, has expreſly delivered of theſe *Therapeutæ*, viz. *that they were Apoſtolical Men, yet of the race of the* Hebrews *(or Jews) and for that Reaſon in a great meaſure obſerved the Jewiſh rites, and inſtitutions, as the Jewiſh Chriſtians* at *Jeruſalem*, and in *Judæa* generally did, even unto the Subverſion of the City by *Titus*. They were then Chriſtians [illegible] Jewiſh-Chriſtians, who both believed in Chriſt, and yet were [illegible] *of the Law*, of which kind we meet with many in the *Acts* of the Apoſtles. Whoever will impartially conſider what has been ſaid, will (I hope) be induced to believe they were Chriſtians; I am pretty ſure 'tis the only way to reconcile the Arguments brought on both ſides. The Chriſtians then, (as I deſigned to prove) muſt have been many at *Alexandria*, and in *Ægypt*, whilſt *Mark* preſided there or ſoon after: they had many Churches, and *Anianus* ſucceeded *Mark* in the Government of them, we reading of no other Biſhops, then at or near *Alexandria*, but *Anianus*; Mr. *O.* has not told us of one.

Yet Mr. *O.* pleads——"*Mark* was no reſident Evangeliſt at *Def.* p. 146.
"*Alexandria*, but a Companion of *Peter*'s, and *Paul*'s in their
"Travels up and down, with *Paul*, *Acts* 12. 25. ch. 13. 13. 2 *Tim.* 4. 11.
"*Philemon.* 24. *Col.* 4. 10. with *Barnabas*, *Acts* 15. 39. and at *Cyprus*: with
"*Peter* at *Babylon*, 1 *Ep.* 5. 13. And ſince he was thus employ'd in divers
"Countries one after another by theſe three Apoſtles, he could not be the Re-
"ſident Evangeliſt at *Alexandria*.

Anſ. Firſt, all this is nothing to the Argument drawn from *Anianus* his ſucceeding *Mark*, and having the Adminiſtration of the Church of *Alexandria* committed to him; for he might ſucceed in the Adminiſtration, when the Evangeliſt left it, and betook himſelf to another Work. *Secondly*, I conceive there were three ſeveral Perſons Named *Mark*, all to be found in the Scriptures before cited; for 'tis in no wiſe probable, that *Paul*, and *Barnabas*, and *Peter*, ſhould all have the ſame Perſon to be their Diſciple and Companion, ſince they all took a different Courſe, and Travelled into diſtant Provinces to propagate the Goſpel. *Thirdly*, *Paul* fell out with, and ſeparated from *Barnabas*, who took *Mark* along with him, *Paul* refuſing it, *Acts* 15. 28. we never read that they pieced again. 'Tis not likely then, that the ſame *Mark* ſhould accompany *Paul* afterwards; and yet we read of one *Mark* with *Paul*, all along in the Texts alledged; Nor can it be thought that *Paul* would receive this *Mark* again, who had deſerted

F 2 him,

him, and for that reaſon been rejected by him. *Fourthly*, There was not a right underſtanding between *Peter* and *Paul*, as appears from the Epiſtles to the *Galatians* and *Corinthians*. 'Tis not then probable, that the ſame *Mark* attended them both. *Fifthly*, The ſeveral Characters and Deſcriptions, given unto *Mark* in the places adduced by Mr. *O.* do imply that there were three of that Name. *Firſt*, In *Acts* 12. 12. *Ch.* 13. 13. *Ch.* 15. 37, 39. the *Mark* in all theſe Texts ſpoken of, is either called *John* only, or *John ſirnamed Mark*: but he quite forſook *Paul*, and adhered to *Barnabas* in the laſt quoted place, *Act.* 15. 39. This note of diſtinction imports, that there were other *Marks*, beſides this *John*. For *Secondly*, I read of *Mark* the Nephew of *Barnabas*, or *Barnabas's Siſter's Son*, *Col.* 4. 10. He doubtleſs was the Man, who was *Paul's* Diſciple and Companion, after his ſeparation from *Barnabas*, and continued with him to the end of *Paul's* Life. *Col.* 4. 10. *Philem.* 24. 2 *Tim.* 4. 11. But laſtly there was a *Mark*, *Peter's* Son, and with *Peter*, when he wrote his firſt Epiſtle at *Babylon*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 13. For the ſeveral Reaſons before alledged, he could be neither of the two former *Marks*, and moreover *Euſebius* conſtantly makes him the Diſciple, Interpreter, and Follower of *Peter*. 'Tis then incredible, he ſhould have been the Companion of *Paul* or of *Barnabas*. This laſt alſo is the Evangeliſt, of whom the diſpute is betwixt Mr. *O.* and me, who is but once mentioned in Scripture, and that at *Babylon*, which being in *Ægypt* (as many with reaſon hold) he might be a Reſident Evangeliſt at *Alexandria*, though occaſionally with *Peter* at the writing that Epiſtle at *Babylon*. But if any will contend St. *Peter's Babylon* was *Rome*, be it ſo what abſurdity is it to affirm with *Euſebius*, that *Peter* ſent him from *Rome* to *Alexandria*, where he planted that Church, and departing this life bequeathed the Government of it to *Annianus*. Yet once more admitting *Mark*, after he had formed and regulated that Church of *Alexandria*, to have removed unto ſome other Cities and Countries (for I am by no means obliged to maintain that he dy'd there, nor does *Euſebius* expreſly ſay ſo, that I know of) 'tis enough for me to affirm with *Euſebius*, *that* Annianus *took the Adminiſtration of that Church of* Alexandria, *after* Mark *left it.* To conclude, if there was but one *Mark*, who ſometimes was with *Peter*, at other times with *Paul* and *Barnabas*, then with *Barnabas* alone, after that with *Paul* again, and laſtly with *Peter*, yet this hinders not, but at laſt he ſettled at *Alexandria*. Neither will his occaſional removals thence at the Apoſtle's call, deſtroy his Reſidence, *See part the Firſt*, *Chapter the Fifth*, whither I refer the Reader for Satisfaction: 'Tis high time now to conſider Mr. *O's Plea*, on this Argument. I am referred to Page. 126. St. *Jerom* is the only Ancient Author, that has any thing of the particular manner of Church Government eſtabliſhed, by *Mark* at *Alexandria*, and on whoſe Authority the Presbyterians very much rely. What he ſays is ——*The* Alexandrian *Presbyters, from* Mark *to* Heraclas, *and* Dionyſ. *call'd one choſen from among themſelves, and placed in a higher degree*, I ſay, *called him Biſhop*. But he tells us not, who choſe him, nor who Ordained him, ſo that we are yet at a loſs, as to one main part of the Controverſy, for any thing *Jerom* has diſcovered to us. Only one would have expected, that if the Presbyters at any time had Ordained their Biſhop, this Father would not have failed to let us know it, for the Honour of himſelf, and those

Euſ. Ec. Hiſt. lib. 2. ch. 15. l. 3. ch. 39. l. 5. c. 8.

E.H.l. c.24.

E. ad Evag.

thoſe of his own Order. He alſo informs us in the ſame Epiſtle that——*One Presbyter was ſet over the reſt for a remedy againſt Schiſm*, and this was done *Poſtea*, that is, after *John*'s two laſt Epiſtles, thoſe of *Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the firſt of *Peter* were written: for Biſhop and Presbyter, were all one till then, as He ſuppoſes, and we muſt be made to believe. But 'tis very hard to believe all this upon the credit of *Jerom*: Nay, *Jerom* himſelf did not believe it, if we may believe him: for he confeſſes, that *Paul* made *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*. How then comes in this *Poſtea*, after he had quoted St. *Paul*'s firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*? For if ever *Timothy* was made Biſhop of *Epheſus* by *Paul*, 'twas before St. *Paul* wrote that Epiſtle. And if ſo, how comes *Jerom* to ſay, that the deviſe was formed — *Poſtea*, &c. that is, after the Writing of that Epiſtle, that is, after *Timothy* was made Biſhop of *Epheſus*. All that can be ſaid, the good Father writes ſomewhat confuſedly, and is inconſiſtent with himſelf. But to let this paſs at preſent. One thing only is very obſervable, that if St. *Paul* conſtituted *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, if *James* was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, *ſtatim poſt Apoſtolos*, and if *Mark* appointed a Biſhop to be choſen, and ſet over reſt of the Presbyters at *Alexandria*, then this Remedy againſt Schiſm was found out, and eſtabliſh'd in the Apoſtle's Days; it being certain, that *Mark* dy'd before *Peter* and *Paul*, or *John*. I might argue to the ſame purpoſe, from another Paſſage in *Jerom*, who affirms, that *Mark himſelf was the firſt Biſhop of* Alexandria. Therefore this Remedy againſt Schiſm was preſcribed in the Apoſtle's Days, and by the Apoſtles alſo, and therefore Biſhops muſt needs be of Divine Inſtitution, even in the Opinion of *Jerom* himſelf. But ſtill the difficulty remains, who choſe and Ordained the Biſhop, after *Mark* was gone. Here Mr. *O.* thinks He has caught us, having found an unqueſtionable Teſtimony, that the Preſbyters at *Alexandria*, both choſe their Biſhop, and Ordained him, yea, and Ordained one another: So 'tis teſtified by *Eutychius* in his *Origines Alexandrinæ*, ſet forth by Mr. *Selden* many Years ago. His Words are, "*Mark* appointed *Hananias* (or *Annianus*) firſt Patriarch (or Bi-
"ſhop) of *Alexandria*, and Twelve Preſbyters his conſtant Aſſiſtants, to the
"end, that when the Patriarchſhip was vacant, they ſhould chuſe one of their
"own Number, ſhould lay hands on his Head, and bleſs him, and create him
"their Patriarch: then after that they ſhould elect ſome Eminent Perſon, and
"make him Presbyter in the Room of him, who was made Patriarch, that ſo
"there ſhould be always Twelve Pr ſbyters, &c.

Jer. S. E. in Tim.

Proœm. in Comm. ſup. mat.

" This Mr. *O.* calls a full proof of Preſbyters, chuſing and
"creating their Biſhop, and that by Impoſition of Hands,
" and Benediction or Prayer, alſo of Presbyters making Preſbyters.

Def. p. 128.129.

Before I give a direct reply, I will try what can be gathered from this Narrative of *Eutychius*, in favour of Epiſcopal Government. *Firſt*, 'Tis Natural, hence to gather that *Mark*, not ſo much as dreamed of a Parity between the Biſhop and his Preſbyters. His conceit was there ſhould be Twelve Preſbyters, anſwerable to the Apoſtles, and a Biſhop, over them like Chriſt over his Apoſtles. *Secondly*, By this Conſtitution of *Mark*'s at *Alexandria*, Epiſcopacy muſt be acknowledged, the firſt Government ſet up in that Church, and becauſe *Mark* was an inſpired Evangeliſt, it was Divine alſo. *Thirdly*, Note, that according to *Eutychius*, the Preſbyters were to chuſe their Biſhop,

Biſhop, and not the People, which the Diſſenters will not very well like of, *Fourthly*, That the Presbyters Ordained new Presbyters, which will ſcarce go down with the Diſſenting Congregations now a Days. *Fifthly*, That excepting accidents the Patriarch or (as Mr. *O.*) the Moderator of the Claſs was choſen for Life, which the Presbyterians will not allow of. *Sixthly*, That the Diſſenters are every whit, as much departed from the Obſervance of St. *Mark*'s model, as they can pretend we are, yea, and much more too.

Thus much being premiſed; that which I would reply to *Eutychius* his ſtory is, that he is the firſt that told it, that he is an Author of no Credit, and that there are conſiderable exceptions to be made againſt him, and his Tale. They are as follows.——

Firſt, He is acknowledged by *Selden* himſelf, to have lived but in the Tenth Century, about 900 Years after the pretended conſtitution of St. *Mark*. He alledges no Writer or Records known unto us, from whence he received this account, nor is it known that there were any ſuch. Beſides, *Jerom* who was ſeveral times in *Egypt*, knew nothing of this, which is very ſtrange, *Eutychius* ſhould 500 Years after, and when their Records had been deſtroyed by the *Saracens*. It muſt then reſt upon the credit of *Eutychius* himſelf alone, and what that is will appear by and by. In the mean time this Tale of *Eutychius* muſt not paſs, being wrote by one, who lived at ſo great a diſtance of time from the matter of Fact, delivered by Him without any other known Ancienter Author to ſupport him, beſides, He is an Obſcure Writer Pop't up into the World to ſerve a cauſe, and therefore cannot Merit belief.

Secondly, *Eutychius* differs from many Authors of more Unqueſtionable Authority than himſelf. He differs from *Ignatius*, who affirms that Presbyters ought to *do nothing without the Biſhop, not Baptize, not Marry, not Celebrate the* Euchariſt *without the Biſhop:* but according to *Eutychius*, they Ordained without him. He differs from *Euſebius*, ſo far at leaſt as to relate, what *Euſebius* knew nothing of. It is very ſtrange that *Euſebius* ſo diligent, and ſo exact an Hiſtorian, ſo curious, and inquiſitive a Searcher, into the Antiquities of the moſt Eminent Churches, from their firſt Plantation, particularly this of *Alexandria*, ſhould not have diſcovered any thing, of the Presbyters Ordaining their Biſhop and one another: that, he that has acquainted us with the Names of all the Patriarchs from *Mark* to *Alexander*, the preciſe Order of their Succeſſion, the Year when every Biſhop ſucceeded, in what Emperor's Reign it was, and ſundry, other remarkable things which happened in that Church, ſhould be wholly ſilent, and ignorant of this Conſtitution, of St. *Mark*. More over *Eutychius* ſays, that *Mark* wrote the Goſpel which bears his Name, in the firſt Year of *Nero*'s Reign; but *Euſebius* affirms, it was done in the Days of *Claudius*, *Nero*'s Predeceſſor. *Eutychius* tells us, that *Mark* was ſlain in the firſt Year of *Nero*, *Euſebius* not till the Eighth at ſooneſt. He differs from St. *Jerom* too who reports, that all the New Teſtament was wrote in Greek, except the Goſpel of *Matthew*; but *Eutychius* will have it, that *Mark* wrote his in the Latin Tongue. Briefly, then he differs from ſome Authors (quoted by *Selden* himſelf) in whom he read of three Presbyters, Seven Deacons, and Eleven other Eccleſiaſtical

E. H. lib. 2. ch. 15.

Lib. 2. ch. 24.
Preface ad Evang.

Page 14.

Eccleſiaſtical Officers, of what Character is not ſaid; whereas *Eutychius* mentions Twelve only, and all thoſe Presbyters: on theſe accounts, then he is of very little credit.

Thirdly, He relates many things in his Annals (whereof theſe *Origines* are a part) againſt the Faith of all approved Hiſtory. He makes the Council of *Nice*, to have conſiſted of 2048. Biſhops, which is not credible: He ſays, *Peter* was crucified in the Twenty Second Year after Chriſt: and he reckons *Origen* a Biſhop.

Fourthly, Even in theſe *Origines*, he is not at one with himſelf. He writes, that "*Mark* went unto *Rome* to preach the Goſpel, that then *Claudius Cæſar* dy'd, and "*Nero* ſucceeded him: that in the Reign of *Nero*, *Peter* the Prince of the Apo"ſtles, wrote the Goſpel of *Mark*, with *Mark* in the *Roman* Tongue, and in the "City of *Rome*, and yet that *Mark* was ſlain at *Alexandria*, in the firſt Year of "*Nero*. But if *Mark* was Martyr'd at *Alexandria*, in the firſt Year of *Nero*, it cannot be, that he was at *Rome* with *Peter* in *Nero's* Reign, and joyned with him in Writing the Goſpel.

Fifthly, *Eutychius's* ſtory ſeems moſt improbable, and in my Judgment overthrows its ſelf. For if the Presbyters had the Power, firſt of chuſing, and then Ordaining one from among themſelves to be Patriarch, and after that, Ordained the new Presbyter alſo, to what purpoſe was a Biſhop created? was he to be a Biſhop of Clouts, to ſit in his Chair and gravely to look on, whilſt the Eleven Presbyters Choſe and Ordained the Twelveth, and he have no Hand in it?

Sixthly, The *Origines* conſiſts of ſo many Childiſh, Ridiculous, and Abſurd Relations, that no wiſe Man can given any credit to ſo trifling an Author. That ſtory of *Mark's* going to a Shoe-Maker or Cobler, to have his Shoe-Latchet mended; of *Hananias* pricking his Finger with the Awl, and thereupon growing Angry: of *Mark's* pacifying him with a Promiſe to heal his Finger, if He would belive in Chriſt: of *Hananias* believing and being cured; and *Laſtly*, of *Mark's* Baptizing him thereupon, and making him Patriarch of *Alexandria*, is to me incredible. Another of the like Nature, is that of *Alexander's* deſiring that the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, ſhould not be called *Papa*, whereas it had been decreed before in the Days of *Heracles* (I ſuppoſe for diſtinctions ſake) Biſhops being ſtiled Fathers, therefore it was judged fit, that the Patriarch ſhould be Honoured with the Title of Grand-Father. But why *Alexander* ſhould be ſo Self-denying, as to refuſe an Honourable Title, which ſeveral of his Predeceſſors had had before him, is to me a Myſtery. Again, that wonderful deſign of *Mark* (as *Eutychius* reports it, to have always the exact Number of Twelve Presbyters in *Alexandria*, appears to me not very Solid. *Laſtly*, of the ſame ſtamp is, that requeſt of *Peter* to be crucify'd with his Head downward, that he might not have the Honour to die, in the ſame manner as Jeſus Chriſt did. I fancy, that *Peter* never requeſted ſuch a thing, or if He did, that *Nero* never granted it.

Seventhly, Whereas *Eutychius* would make us believe, that *Mark's* Rule about the Presbyters of *Alexandria* (not the Neighbouring Biſhops of *Egypt*) chuſing and Ordaining the Patriarchs, and Presbyters continued unto the Days of *Alexander*, (who muſt therefore be the laſt that was Ordained by the Presbyters, about the Year 310.): Yet St. *Cyprian*, who flouriſh'd above 60 Years before *Alexander*, has ſomething that makes me ſuſpect the contrary, and that *Mark* eſtabliſh'd

[Ep. 67. Ox.] eſtabliſh'd no ſuch Order at *Alexandria*, St. *Cyprian's* Words are theſe——*Propter quod diligenter de Traditione divina, & Apoſtolica obſervatione ſervandum eſt, & tenendum, quod apud nos quoque, & fere per Provincias Univerſas tenetur, ut ad Ordinationes rite Celebrandas, ad eam plebem Cui Præpoſitus Ordinatur, Epiſcopi ejuſdem Provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, & Epiſcopus deligatur plebe præſente*, &c. This is part of a Letter, written by the Biſhop of *Carthage*, to the Churches of *Leon*, *Aſturica*, and *Eme-rita* in *Spain*: from whence 'tis manifeſt, that this was a Divine Tradition, an A-poſtolical Practice, that the Biſhops of the Province ſhould Aſſemble, Chuſe and Ordain a new Biſhop, and that *it univerſally obtained, apud nos* (ſays the Father) *among us* in *Africa*, and almoſt in all the Provinces in the World, in the *Roman* Empire beſure. And I take *Cyprias* to be a much truſtier Author, than *Eutychius*, or *Jerom* either.

[Cod. Can. Vind. l. 1. c. 4.] To ſupport this Teſtimony of St. *Cyprian*, I produce the *Firſt*, of the Apoſto-lical Canons, which were collected before St. *Cyprian*, at leaſt a good while before the *Nicene* Council (as Dr. *Beverigde* has ſhewn) wherein, as is by *Selden* pretended, the Cuſtom of *Alexandria* was alter'd; but that cannot be, as may be gathered from the firſt Canon aforeſaid, which runs thus——ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν. If then this Apoſtolical Canon was in force before the Council of *Nice*, then it was not the *Nicene* Council, which altered the *Alexandrian* Cuſtom, as *Eutychius* and *Selden* ſuppoſe, it having been a much more Ancient practiſe, it ſeems for the Provincial Biſhops, to Ordain Biſhops. And ſo *Eutychius* is miſtaken in this point alſo. If ever there was ſuch a Rule eſtabliſh'd by *Mark* at *Alexandria*, of Preſbyters Ordaining Biſhops, or Preſ-byters, it was changed before *Alexander* or the *Nicene* Council, yea, before St. *Cyprian's* time.

[Vind. Ig. Epiſ. Part. 1. c. 10.] *Eighthly*, Whereas *Eutychius* aſſerts, there were no Biſhops in *Egypt* till *Deme-trius*, it is proved to the contrary by that moſt Learned Prelate Biſhop *Pearſon*, from ſeveral good Teſtimonies, and particu-larly from the *Vetus Vita Marci*, and *Rabanus Maurus* Abbot of *Fulda*, of both which Mr. *Selden* likewiſe takes Notice. The former writes thus——*Pentapolim pergit* (*Marcus*) *& Ordinans Epiſcopos, per Re-giones illas, & Clericos; iterum* Alexandriam *venit*. The latter thus——*Ordina-verat* (*Marcus*) *pro ſe Epiſcopum* Annianum, *aliis quoque longe lateq; Eccleſiis E-piſcopos*. Mr. *Selden* to avoid the force of theſe Teſtimonies has invented this Shift, *ſc.* that *Mark* made theſe Biſhops in *Pentapolis* only, and not in *Egypt*. If one ask'd why *Mark* ſhould make Biſhops in *Pentapolis*, and not in *Egypt* alſo, it would be hard for Mr. *O.* to give a ſatisfactory anſwer to it. Beſides 'tis ſaid, that *Mark* made Biſhops, *per Regiones illas*, doubtleſs the meaning is through all the Countries, that he travelled between *Alexandria* and *Pentapolis*; and ſurely *Egypt* was one of them. And why ſhould one Patriarch or Biſhop, ſuffice for *Alexandria* and all *Egypt*, but not for *Pentapolis*? Except Mr. *O.* would be ſo kind as to furniſh us, with ſo early an inſtance, of a vaſt City and Province, under the Government of one ſingle Biſhop. It cannot then be queſtioned, but that there were from the beginning Biſhops in the Province of *Egypt*, as well as one in the City of *Alexandria*.

Ninethly,

Ninthly, Whereas *Eutychius* ſays, that *Mark* appointed the Twelve Presbyters to chuſe their Patriarch, and by Impoſition of Hands, and Prayers to Ordain him, yet Biſhop *Pearſon* has produc'd ſeveral good Authorities to the contrary, ſhewing they were not Ordained by the Presbyters; as firſt the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions atteſt. Of *Abilius* who ſucceeded *Annianus*———[illegible], and *Jerom*'s Chronicle, we read that *Abilius* was choſen *ex Presbyteris, & Secundum Græcorum Traditionem a Sancto Luca Ordinatus eſt*, that is, *Abilius was choſen out of the Presbyters* (*or from among them*, as *Jerom* has it, not by 'em) *and according to the Tradition of the Greek Church, was Ordained by St.* Luke. Furthermore *Severus*, who wrote the Lives of the *Alexandrian* Patriarchs, informs us, that *Cerdon* who ſucceeded *Abilius*, and *Cerdon*'s Succeſſors unto *Demetrius*, were Ordained by the Biſhops out of that Region, that is, *Egypt*, I ſuppoſe. By all which it appears, that there were Biſhops in *Egypt* before *Demetrius*, who Ordained the Patriarch, or Biſhop of *Alexandria*.

Ubi Supra.

Tenthly, It is not like, that *Eutychius* had any Authentick Records, belonging to the Churches of *Alexandria* and *Egypt*, the *Saracens* having deſtroy'd and burnt 'em all, long before *Eutychius* was born; ſo that where he wanders from the Truth, or when he trifles, we muſt conclude, he fram'd his Annals, and *Origines* out of his own Brains, or ſome uncertain Monkiſh Traditions and Legends, then currant among them.

To conclude, ſuppoſing the *Alexandrian* Presbyters, by St. *Mark*'s appointment, did Elect the Patriarch or Biſhop, yea, and Ordain him too, yet it muſt be confeſs'd, that Biſhops) however choſen and Ordained) are as early as he, and by Divine Right, St. *Mark* being a Perſon inſpired, and conſequently having Authority from God, at leaſt from the Apoſtles, to eſtabliſh the Government of the Chuches, which he founded, with what Face then could *Selden* produce theſe *Origines*, to juſtifie the Presbyterian deſign in the late Troubles (I do not now ſay for altering the way of chooſing, and Ordaining them) but for quite extirpating Epiſcopacy? Or with what Colour of Reaſon can Mr. *O.* argue againſt Epiſcopacy, and blame us for not obſerving the ſuppoſed Method of chuſing and Ordaining our Biſhops, whilſt himſelf and his Partizans are undermining the Fabrick, which St. *Mark* is confeſt to have built, and levelling it to the very Foundation? Let our Adverſaries firſt conform themſelves to this Rule of St. *Mark*, let them in every City chuſe, and Ordain a Biſhop for Life, unto whom themſelves, and all the Faithful in the City and Country adjacent muſt be Subject, and unto whoſe care and conduct, the Adminiſtration of the Eccleſiaſtical Affairs may chiefly be committed, and when they have done this, then let them lay before us this ſpecial Author *Eutychius*; It will be time enough then to conſider farther of him: Mean while it ſeems not fair nor honeſt, to bring this Fabulous inſtance on the Stage againſt us, which they themſelves will not be guided by.

The ſumm is *Eutychius*, of whom we have been ſpeaking, liv'd about 900 Years diſtance from the Fact by him related, without any intermediate Teſtimony to confirm his ſtory: He differs in many things from ſeveral good Authors of much more credit than himſelf; He relates things againſt the Faith of all Hiſtory; he contradicts himſelf, his own ſtory confutes its ſelf, he intermixes many little Fooliſh and very improbable Remarks, he is contradicted by more Ancient Wri-

ters, yea, and more unqueſtionable than himſelf; *Jerom*, whoſe deſign and Argument needed it, makes no mention of that Conſtitution of St. *Mark*, and laſtly, the Diſſenters themſelves obſerve it not. By this inſtance therefore, if they do us harm they do themſelves no good, yea, rather hereby they condemn themſelves.

Unr. of Sep. 2d Ed. p. 380. But *Laſtly*, againſt the Teſtimony of *Eutychius*, I lay that of *Ab. Echellenſis* in *Orig. Alexand. Eccl.* which I borrow from the Biſhop of *Worceſter*. *Echellenſis* tells us out of *Severus Alex.* Biſhop of the *Aſmunim*, and of the Sect of the *Copti* or *Jacobites*, that *after the Death of the Patriarch, the Presbyters met together and prayed, and proceeded to Election; The firſt Presbyter declared it belonged to them to chooſe their Biſhop, and to the other Biſhops* (in *Egypt*) *to conſecrate him. To which the Biſhops then preſent aſſented, only ſaying, if he were worthy they would conſecrate him, whom they choſe, but not otherwiſe*: So then they had it ſeems, a Negative Voice in the Election. And *Elmacinus* makes this a Conſtitution of St. *Mark* in the firſt Foundation of that Church, and ſaith it continued to the *Nicene* Council, about which time it was ordered, that the Biſhop might be choſen from any place or Church whatever, and this was all the Alteration in the Conſtitution of the *Alexandrian* Church at the Council of *Nice*, whatever *Selden* or *Eutychius* ſay to the contrary.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Syriac *Tranſlation of the New Teſtament.*

Plea p. 14. MR. *O.* argues, *that the old Syriac Tranſlation, which is ſo very Ancient, that it comes near in time to the Originals, uſeth not two Words, one for Biſhop, another for Presbyter, as our Tranſlation and the Greek do; but it hath only* Kaſhiſha: *The Word in* Chaldee, *and in* Syriac, *ſignifies Presbyters*. From whence we are to conclude, that in the Opinion of the *Syriac* Tranſlators, Biſhops and Prieſts (though two Words in the Greek) are nevertheleſs but one, and the ſame Species of Church-Officers, and therefore expreſs'd but by one Word in the *Syriac* Tranſlation, which properly *ſignifies, Presbyters*, or *Elders*.

Firſt, Suppoſing all this true, *viz.* that Biſhop and Presbyter in Scripture denote, one and the ſame kind of Church-Officer, in the Judgment of the *Syriac* Tranſlators, who therefore deſcribed them by one Word only in their own Language: Yet this hinders not but that there was another Order of Eccleſiaſtical Rulers, Superiour to Biſhops and Presbyters. Thus much (I take it) has been abundantly proved already in the Inſtances of *Timothy* and *Titus*, being ſuch Church Governours, Superior to the Biſhops and Presbyters, though not diſtinguiſh'd by any Special and appropriate Title. So that, if all Mr. *O.* has here ſaid, and his Deduction from it were true, 'twill do him no Service, nor us any diſadvantage in the preſent Cauſe. But

Secondly,

Secondly, I very much queſtion, whether what he has laid down concerning the *Syriac* Verſion be true; Nay, 'tis moſt certainly falſe. For obſerve

First, That the Word [illegible] being uſed in the Greek Teſtament above threeſcore times, is by the *Syriac* Tranſlators always rendred by *Kaſhiſhas* without one exception hereunto. And with reaſon ſince the *Syriac* Word *Kaſhiſhas*, being deſcended from the *Radix Kaſhaſh ſenuit, conſenuit, ſeneuit*, does moſt properly ſignifie Presbyter or Elder. But

Secondly, That [illegible], underſtand with its conjugates, is rendred in the *Syriac* Tranſlation not *only* by *Kaſhiſhas*, but by Sundry other Words, and oftner by other Words than by *Kaſhiſhas*: For *Kaſhiſhas* is only thrice uſed to expreſs Biſhop by, as *Tit.* 1. 7. 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. *Phi.* 1. 1. In all which places the Latine of the *Syriac* has *Presbyter* not *Epiſcopus*: And from hence it may indeed with ſome reaſon be argued, that Biſhop in all theſe places of Scripture, denotes no more than Presbyter or Elder, at leaſt in the Opinion of the *Syriac* Tranſlators; it is no more than what I my ſelf was content formerly to take for granted. But, then in other places of Scripture [illegible] (and its Conjugates) are in the *Syriac* Verſion, rendred by Words, nothing akin to *Kaſhaſh*, and of very different ſignification from it; as *Acts* 1. 20. where the Apoſtleſhip is called [illegible] Biſhoprick, the *Syriac* Tranſlators render it not by *Kaſhiſhutha Presbyteratum*, or the Presbyterial Office, but by *Teſmeſhtah*. So *Acts* the 20. 28. [illegible]. is tranſlated *Episkupea*, the Greek Word being adopted into the *Syriac* Tongue. In the 1 *Pet.* 2. 12. [illegible] (which we render *Viſitation*) is in *Syriac Bachrana* Examination, and v. 25. where the Apoſtle deſcribes Jeſus Chriſt [illegible], the *Syriac* Tranſlators call him *Saurea* and *Luke* 19. 44. *Suarana*, whoſe Primitive *Sear* ſignifies *viſitare, recenſere, animadvertere*, the ſame is uſed for [illegible] Ch. 2.

The ſum of what has been ſaid upon this Head, is as follows.

First, That Mr. *O.* after his uſual manner, has given an unfair and falſe account of the *Syriac* Tranſlation, which is ſo far from confining its ſelf to one Word only (and not uſing two, one for Biſhops and another for Presbyters) that it [illegible] at leaſt, beſides *Kaſhiſhas* for Biſhop and the Conjugates.

Secondly, From the premiſes it appears very probable, that the *Syriac* Tranſlators did not take [illegible] and [illegible] in the Original to be one, and the ſame Order of Church-Officers throughout the New Teſtament. For though 'tis not unlikely, they believed Biſhops to be the very ſame with Presbyters, in *Phil.* 1. 1. in 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2. and in *Tit.* 1. 7. becauſe they keep cloſe to that Word *Kaſhiſhas*; Yet when they expound [illegible] and its Conjugates in other places by different Words, 'tis altogether as likely, that they believed the Biſhop to be a Church-Officer of a different kind. Whereas then ſometime they deſcribe the ſame Perſons by *Kaſhiſhas*, and ſome other Words in the *Syriac* Tongue, of a different ſignification as *Acts* 20. 17, 28 and 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, it is altogether as probable, that thoſe Perſons were more than meer Presbyters, as that thoſe Biſhops in other places called Presbyters, were no other than Presbyters, the difference of expreſſion being as good an Argument one way, as identity of expreſſion is the other, or rather better. For as much as 'tis more frequent in Scripture, to ſtile Superior Officers by Inferior Titles than the contrary; and the reaſon is plain; not only becauſe Modeſty and Humility requires it, but there is ſomething in the Nature of the thing that leads to it, *ſc.* becauſe Superior

are commonly inveſted with all thoſe Powers, which Inferiors have ; but Inferiors cannot pretend to all the Power, that Superiors have. 'Tis no wonder therefore to me, if Biſhops are ſometimes ſtil'd Presbyters, ſince the Apoſtles themſelves in Scripture, and Biſhops oftentimes in Antiquity are ſo called. Therefore

Thirdly, Mr. *O.* has not got the leaſt advantage of us, by ſtarting this Criticiſm about the *Syriac* Tranſlation ; But rather has loſt ground, ſo far as theſe Tranſlator's Authority will go. For becauſe he thought it a good Argument on his ſide, that the *Syriac* Tranſlators of the New Teſtament (as He imagined) uſed not two Words for Biſhop and Presbyter, but one only, *ſc. Kaſhiſhaa* ; it follows, that becauſe 'tis found to the contrary, that they uſed ſeveral other Words, none of which are employ'd to expreſs Presbyter by, this ought to be taken as a good proof on our ſide, that even in the New Teſtament there is a diſtinction, between the Order of a Biſhop, and that of a Presbyter, if Mr. *O's* own way of reaſoning has any force in it.

Finally, if the *Syriac* Verſion be ſo very Ancient as Mr. *O.* thinks, one might believe *Ignatius* to have had an hand in the Tranſlation ; For he was a Biſhop of *Syria*. And who then can imagine the Tranſlators to have ſo much as Dream'd of the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters ?

CHAP. V.

Concerning the Church-Government, in the North-Weſt parts of Scotland.

THere is an Argument for the Government of Churches and Ordination by Presbyters drawn from the *Scots*, who being converted to Chriſtianity about the Year 200. (as is thought, upon the Authority of *Tertullian*) had no Biſhops among them, but were Ruled by meer Presbyters only, and that for ſome Centuries after. The Diſſenters argument grounded on this Tradition, is more at large thus, according as it is urged by Mr. *Baxter* their Oracle, as I find in the Hiſtory called *an Account of Church-Government, &c.* by My late Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*.

"*Firſt*, Mr. *Baxter* tells us of a ſort of Men called *Culdees*, that firſt guided "the Affairs of Religion in *Scotland* long before the coming of *Palladius*, and yet "were not Biſhops, but Monks and Presbyters.

"*Secondly*, That theſe *Culdees* choſe ſome few among themſelves to be as "*Governours to the Reſt*, whom Writers called *Scotorum Epiſcopos*, Biſhops of "the *Scots*.

"*Thirdly*, That theſe New found Biſhops of the *Scots*, had only the Name "of Biſhops, about which he (Mr. *Baxter*) will not contend with the Epiſco"pal Party. By the way, nor will I contend about the Name Biſhop, but Mr.

Rivers acknowledges, that they were *as Governours to the Rest*. And here is the thing which is more than the Name only of Biſhops.

" *Fourthly*, That afterwards *Palladius* began a Higher ſort of Biſhops, but the " *Culdees* ſtill kept up the greateſt part againſt him.

" *Fifthly*, That *Columbanus* his Monaſtery, in the Iſle of *Hy* reſtored the *Culdees* ſtrength; and the Monks out of that Iſland, were the moſt prevailing " Clergy of *Scotland*, who had no proper Epiſcopal Ordination, but bare Election and Ordination of Preſbyters.

This piece of Hiſtory is juſt *Eutychius* all over; one would gueſs 'twas *Eutychius* his *Mark*, who firſt converted theſe Northern-*Britains*, and ſetled the Government like unto that at *Alexandria*. But againſt all this, I have in the firſt place to ask, who in good earneſt, converted theſe Northern-*Britains*? Mr. *O.* thinks it was the Southern-*Britains*. I will take him at his Word, and then demand, whether it be not moſt reaſonable to believe that the Northern-*Britains* did, with the Faith receive the ſame Church-Government, as the Southern had, who converted 'em: And that the Southern-*Britains* has Biſhops among them from the beginning, is out of doubt, and confeſs'd by the Elders, and Meſſengers of the Congregational Churches, met at the *Savoy*, *October* the 12th 1658. In the Preface of their Declaration; *that its true in reſpect of the Publick, and open Profeſſion of Presbytery or Independency, this Nation had been a ſtranger to each way, it is poſſible ever ſince it had been Chriſtian* i. e. *till about* 1640.

It is without all doubt to me, that the Southern-*Britains*, very early received the Chriſtian Faith, and perhaps in the Apoſtle's Days, and by St. *Paul* too, as My late Lord of *Worceſter* has made very probable, both from the Teſtimony of many Fathers, and ſome conſiderable Conjectures of his own. But the Queſtion is, whether the Inhabitants of the North, and North-Weſt parts of *Britain* beyond *Edinburgh*, received the Faith before *Columbanus*, ſettled in the Iſland of *Hy* or *Jona*. Our Diſſenters will have it, that theſe North People became Chriſtians, at leaſt about the Year of Chriſt 200. and from that time (until *Palladius* came among them) were governed by Monks and *Culdees*, who were Preſbyters only. This Opinion is grounded chiefly on a known Teſtimony out of *Tertullian*, who writes that the Faith of Chriſt had then reached unto *Britannorum loca Romanis inacceſſa*, and theſe places muſt needs be the North-Weſt parts of *Britain* beyond *Edinburgh*, which the *Romans* had not ſubdued. Now *Tertullian* flouriſhed about the end of the ſecond Century, or beginning of the Third.

Orig. Bri. c. 1.

Tertul. adv. Judaeos c. 7.

Anſ. This Paſſage of *Tertullian* reaches not the point; it can't be hence deduced what was the Government of that Church, ſuppoſing thoſe Northern parts, were thus ſoon converted. Epiſcopacy might have been ſet up there for any thing we know or find proved: And it is likely, it was ſo, if (as Mr. *O.* believes) they received Chriſtianity from the Southern-*Britains*, as I obſerved before. But let us look more narrowly into *Tertullian's* Teſtimony, that ſome parts belonging to the *Britains*, were then become Chriſtians, *viz.* thoſe who had not yet ſubmitted their Necks unto the *Roman* Power. But who theſe were is the Queſtion.

Some

Some think, they were the *Britains* now beyond the *Picts* Wall, who were not Conquered by the *Romans*, and beſides were *ſmall*, and inconſiderable Converſions, no Church being formed or eſtabliſhed among them: For ſo, *Tertullian* in the place cited mentions many other Countries, where happily ſome few ſcattered Chriſtians lived, though no Church was regularly eſtabliſhed. Now though this is ſufficient to convince me, that the People of the *remote* North and North-Weſt of *Scotland* (now ſo called) beyond *Edenburgh*, were not meant by *Tertullian*; yet foreſeeing it will not ſatiſfie others, whoſe Intereſt and Cauſe will not ſuffer them eaſily to be perſwaded, I will therefore take the Liberty to offer my own Thoughts unto the Readers Conſideration.

My Conjecture then is, that the *Loca Britannorum Romanis inacceſſa* referred unto by *Tertullian*, were no other than *Ireland*. *Ptolemy* reckons the Iſlands of the World thus. *Firſt*, *Taprobane* the Greateſt; The next was (*GREAT*) *Britain*, otherwiſe called *Albion*, and the *Third*, [illegible] another Iſland of the *Britains* called *Ireland*. And *Pliny* ſays, *Albion* was named *Britany*, yet all the Neighbouring Iſland were called *Britannies*, and thus *Ireland* of Old time was inhabited by *Britains*. *Ariſtotle* (or whoever was the Author of that Book *de mundo*) Witneſſeth, that there were in the Ocean two the greateſt Iſlands in the World, called *Britannies* "[illegible] & "[illegible], *Albion* and *Ireland*. Thus much I have gathered from Mr. *Cambden*. I ſhall add one of my own Collection from *Dionyſius de ſitu Orbis*, who ſpeaking of our Weſtern Ocean ſays, † "[illegible]. Hereupon who then can doubt, but that *Ireland* was meant by *Tertullian's Britannorum loca*, as well as any other places of the *Britains*, ſince 'tis well known the *Romans* never carried their Arms, nor extended their Conqueſts, ſo far as unto that Iſland, although they were not ignorant of the place, be ſure in *Tertullian's* Days, nor in *Auguſtus's* time, when *Dionyſius* the *African* wrote? *Tertullian* himſelf in the ſame Period adds, and *Multarum Inſularum nobis ignotarum*, many Iſlands unknown to us, where the Goſpel had got footing. But leaſt the contrary Reader ſhould think theſe very Words overthrow my Opinion, and that the Iſland *Ireland*, being unknown to *Tertullian*, cannot be meant by the *Loca Britannorum Romanis inacceſſa*, it muſt be noted that by *ignotarum*, he intends ſuch Iſlands with whom they had no Commerce in Ordinary, nor an exact account of. For that they were wholly ignorant of them cannot be; for then *Tertullian* muſt talk at Random and Nonſenſe. How could He ſay, that Chriſtianity was propagated in theſe *Iſlands*, if they were altogether unknown? There is a paſſage in Archbiſhop *Uſher*, I muſt not paſs over. *Neither did Celeſtine employ leſs care about freeing the Britains from the Pelagian Hereſie, ... while he ſtudies to preſerve the Roman Iſland Catholick, he alſo made the Barbarous Iſland Chriſtian*, the former whereof was *Great-Britain*, the latter *Ireland*. The foregoing Words are *Proſper's*, which *Vitus Boſaſchius* † thus expounds, and thereby illuſtrates *Tertullian*. *When Proſper ſaid* Britannies, *doubtleſs he called the* Roman *Iſland*, Britain, *and the other Iſland called* Barbarous, *he underſtood to be* Ireland, *whither the* *Power*

Lib. *de mundo* C. 3.

Cam. Brit. Eng. Edit. 1. fol. p. 22 & *ibid. ſee Heyl Coſm.*

† *Dion. de ſitu orb. Edit.* Lond. 1658. *Carm.* 565 566.

Brit. Eccl. Prim. Pag 798.

† [illegible]

Power of the Roman *Arms 'tis believed never came.* It will be Objeſted hence, that therefore becauſe the Pope is here ſaid to have ſent a Biſhop (*Palladius* is meant) and by him made *Ireland* Chriſtian, *Ireland* embraced not the Faith till that time, *ſc.* about 430. by conſequence *Tertullian* is not to be underſtood of *Ireland.* But I reply, *Firſtly* That *Proſper* and *Bede*, muſt be ſuppoſed to ſpeak *a-la-mode de Rome*, as believing none were good Chriſtians, but who depended on the Pope. Beſides, *Ireland* was Chriſtian long before this, as the Story of *Columba* proves. But *Secondly*, It may with Reaſon be ſuppoſed, that a great part of *Ireland* was yet unconverted. Or *Thirdly*, The *Scots* a Foreign People, Heathens, and Barbarous had more lately Invaded, and Conquered them, and withal very much impaired the Chriſtian Religion, (as the *Saxons* once did here in *England*) nevertheleſs, that about the Year 430. the Chriſtian Religion, by the Preaching of *Palladius*, or rather St. *Patrick* was reſtored again. If it be demanded of me, how I prove, that *Ireland* became Chriſtian before *Tertullian*, I reply, 'tis proved by the ſame Argument, others would prove that the North and North-Weſt of the now *Scotland*, was ſo early converted, that is, by *Tertullian's* Teſtimony; and which is the moſt likely conjecture, muſt now be left to the Reader. The ſumm is, if *Tertullian* may as well ſpeak of *Ireland*, as of any other place, here is then no proof of ſo early a Converſion in the utmoſt North of *Great Britain.*

But let us hear what Mr. *O.* has advanc'd in this Controverſy: For indeed my buſineſs is with him. He begins then and Acquaints us. *The Hiſtories of* Scotland *tell us, that their Churches were Governed by Presbyters without Biſhops, for above* 200 *Years, and therefore had no Ordination but by Presbyters.* In confirmation hereof, Mr. *O.* cites *Hector Boethius, John Major*, and *John Fordun*, and indeed theſe are the beſt and the moſt Ancient and only Witneſſes, that can be produced in that Cauſe, except the inviſible *Veremundus*, who at beſt was but in the Eleventh Century. But theſe were the moſt Errand Inventors of Legends as ever appeared in publick, having no Authors, no Records before them, to ſupport what they affirm concerning their Country and its affairs.

Plea p.142. 143.

Thus much my Lord of St. *Aſaph* in his Hiſtorical Account has objeſted againſt theſe, and other ſuch Fabulous Hiſtorians: And Mr. *O.* who has read this Learned Biſhop, ought not to have urged theſe Teſtimonies, unleſs he had taken off the Biſhops Exceptions againſt them. True, he tells us, Archbiſhop *Uſher* cites *Fordun* with Approbation, *de primordiis E. Brit.* p. 798. 799. 800. But when I conſult Archbiſhop *Uſher*, I find him indeed citing theſe Authors, *pag* 800. but not, no not *Fordun* Himſelf, with Approbation, unleſs his very citing them muſt be taken as an Approbation of them, which I muſt Acquaint Mr. *O.* in his Error. For the ſaid Archbiſhop in his Preface to that Book foreſeeing the Reader would objeſt againſt him, the Obſcurity and little Credit of many of his Authors ingenuouſly Confeſſes, that he had gathered together a Fardle of all manner of Authors, good and bad, new and old, to the end ſom exact Hiſtorian might from thence pick, what ſeemed to his purpoſe and probable: But that otherwiſe (he adds) *he was not ſo void of ſenſe, as to call in* Geoffry *of* Monmouth, *or* Hector Boethius, *or any other of the lower Form, as Witneſſes of any thing of remote Antiquity.* Hence it follows, that Archbiſhop *Uſher* cites them not with Approbation, eſpecially not *Boethius*, and therefore not *Fordun*, who is the *vir gregis*,

Eis, the *Bell-Weather* and *Leader*, in all the *Romantick* Stories of the Antiquity of the *Scotch* Nation and Church. It is to be obſerved *Hector Boethius*, the laſt of the three takes upon him to mend the former, *Fordun*, and *Major*, ſaying (what Mr. *O.* leaves out) *Palladius was the firſt, that was made Biſhop*, by the Pope *among the Scots; whereas in former times, Biſhops were taken out of the* Culdees and *Monks, the People chuſing them.* Here then the Witneſſes do not agree among themſelves: For *Fordun* ſays without Biſhops, and *Major* Presbyters only, But *Boethius* plainly intimates the *Scots* had Biſhops in former times, though not of the *Roman* Stamp, nor thence ſent unto the *Scots*. *Palladius* was the firſt of the *Roman* Biſhops, not the firſt Biſhop. Whoever choſe 'em is nothing to our purpoſe: The *Scots* had Biſhops before *Palladius*, according to *Boethius*, who were pickt out of the Monks and *Culdees*: But he ſays, not Ordained by them. It may as well be affirmed, that becauſe our Biſhops at this Day are taken out of the Presbyters, that therefore they are Ordained by them. *Laſtly*, The ſaid Archbiſhop *Usher*, there produces another Teſtimony out of *John Bale*, who Writes——" *Palladius* was ſent among the *Scots*, that he might eſtabliſh the " Epiſcopal Order among them, *after the Roman Faſhion*, for (*He adds*) the *Scots* " had before that time their Biſhops, and (other) Miniſters, as it was among " the *Britains* after the *Aſiatick* Manner. But it pleaſed not the *Romans* (*the Popes*) " who affected Ceremonies, and hated the *Aſiaticks*.

But though the *Scots* were Anciently the Inhabitans of *Ireland*, yet ſays Mr. *O.* *theſe Authors call the Ancient Inhabitants of* (the now) Scotland, *by the Name they were known in their own days*, and to them *Palladius* is thought to have been ſent.

True! But 'twas their ignorance or worſe,nothing being more clear,than that the Ancient Inhabitants of the now *Scotland*, were *Britains* and *Picts*, not *Scots*. This is fully made out in the *Hiſtorical Account* of the Church-Government, *&c.* as well as by Archbiſhop *Usher*'s Authorities, to whom I refer the Reader.

Whereas *Bede* l. 5. c. 10. relates, how that *Columba* was the firſt Teacher of the Chriſtian Faith, among the *Transmontane Picts*, to the *North*.

Plea *p.* 144. Mr. *O.* thus gloſſes on that *Paſſage*——*He was the firſt Bede knew of*, implying there were others before, that *Bede* knew not of.

Anſ. At this rate all Authorities may be eluded: And all the Teſtimonies produced by Mr. *O.* in favour of his Cauſe, may eaſily be laid aſide. *Bede* knew no other, yet the contrary is true; thus, I may ſay, *Fordun* and *Major* talk of Presbyters and Monks, among the *Scots* without Biſhops: That is, that they knew of; but however there were Biſhops among them. *Bede* himſelf gives not the leaſt occaſion for this gloſs, but is as poſitive herein, as any Writer can be. And he is a better Witneſs in theſe Matters, than *Fordun*, *Major*, and *Boethius*. Theſe talk of matter before their time a 1000 Years, without any Authority to back their Relations: *Bede*, of things which happened but about 140 Years, only before his time. For *Columba* flouriſhed *Anno* 560. and *Bede* was born *Anno* 707. and flouriſh'd 735. In ſhort then *Bede* might well underſtand what happened at *Hy*; and among the Northern *Picts*,the *English Saxons*, having ſo lately received Chriſtianity from the Biſhops, ſent hither by *Columba*, and his Succeſſors.

" Mr.

" Mr. *O.* goes on to acquaint us, Chriſtianity was much more Ancient in the " North of the now *Scotland*, and that 'tis proved by Biſhop *Cowper*.

Anſ. Biſhop *Cowper*, laboured under the common Diſeaſe of eaſily believing, and advancing the Antiquity and Honour (as he thought) of his own Nation. He brought no Teſtimony of Credit, but that out of *Theodoret*, which belongs unto the Southern *Britains* (for of *Tertullian*'s we have before Treated). But Mr. *O.* would be reſolved in ſome Queries.

" *Firſt*, When the Fathers mention *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, " *Simon Zelotes*, &c. to have Preached the Goſpel in *Britain*, what " reaſon have we to exclude North *Britain*? The zeal of thoſe Apoſtles and Apo- " ſtolical Men, and their Charity would Prompt them, to endeavour the Pro- " pagation of the Goſpel throughout *Britain*; and part of the now *Scotland*, be- " longed then to the *Britiſh* Kings.

Plea *p.* 146.

Anſ. I know no Father that mentions *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, and *Simon Zelotes*, except haply *Dorotheus*, who is the Father of a Thouſand Lyes, or *Fordon*, *Major*, *Boethius*, *Fleming*, *Balaus*, and ſuch other later and Legendary Writers. I can give ſe- veral good reaſons againſt the North-*Britains* being ſo early converted, and good ones too, as I think *Britain* Anciently was divided into very many petty Kingdoms: None of the Princes received the Faith very early (that we know of) ſave *Lucius* perhaps: The *Romans* never penetrated in- to the now *Scotland*, till a good while after, and it was by their means in part, that Chriſtianity ſpread its ſelf. The *Picts* in North-*Scotland* never ſtoop't to their Yoke, which rendred their Converſion more difficult. And ſomething (I hope) in this point may be aſcribed unto the Secret Will and Providence of God. Can Mr. *O.* give me any other Reaſons than ſuch as theſe, that the *Sax- ons* and *Angli* in *Germany*, who over-run *Britain*, were no ſooner converted, tho' *Tertullian* reckons the *Germans* in General, to have been Chriſtians in his time? Nor were the Apoſtles themſelves, nor the Apoſtolical Men always Succeſsful in their endeavours. St. *Paul* was forbid to Preach in *Aſia*, *Acts*, 16. 6. 'Tis a wretched way of proving a matter of Fact in Queſtion, from ſuch ſlender Pro- babilities. By the like Arguments one might prove, that all *Europe*, *Aſia* and *Africa*, embraced the Goſpel a Thouſand Years ſince, even the moſt Northern *Scythians*, the moſt Eaſtern *Indians* and *Seres*, and the *Africans* about the Cape of *Good-Hope*. In ſhort, though *Paul plants, and* Apollos *Waters, yet 'tis God, who gives the Increaſe.* 'Tis certain the Apoſtles themſelves did not always take Fiſh, where-ever they caſt their Net. Our Lord foretold them as much, directing them therefore to *ſhake off the duſt of their Feet, as a Teſtimony againſt them, that rejected their Doctrine.* But enough of Mr. *O*'s firſt Query.

See *Bellar. de* S. B. p. 91.

Secondly, " He asks if the North-*Britains* received their firſt Converſion by " Men ſent from *Rome* (as ſeems from *Bede*, E. H. l. 3. c. 4) How came they to keep their *Eaſter*, after the Eaſtern Manner.

Anſ. This is accounted for by the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, and Mr. *O.* ought to have acquieſs'd, or elſe refuted the Biſhop, and not thus frivolouſly repeated the bare Ob- jection about *Eaſter*, without Vindicating it againſt the Biſhop. But he ſeems to read Books on purpoſe to furniſh himſelf with little Objections; not with a diſpoſition to hearken unto Reaſon, but to Spin out, and continue

Hiſt. Account *p.* 66. § 7.

R disputes

diſputes for Ever. Beſides, the North Britain (here ſo called by Mr. *O.*) is by *Bede* in his Hiſtory deſcribed, to be the moſt Southern part of the now *Scotland*, adjoyning unto *England*, and called *Galloway* or *Annandale*, on this ſide *Edenburgh*. But what is this, to the Northern *Tramontane Picts*, beyond *Edenburgh*, whither we ſay the *Romans*, neither *Gentiles* nor Chriſtians, nor the Chriſtian Religion, ever reached before *Columba* ſettled at *Hy*, who alſo came thither not from *Rome*, but *Ireland*.

Def. p. 148. Mr. *O.* further pleads theſe words of *Bede*, l. 1. ch. 13. "That "by the Pope *Palladius* was ſent *primus Epiſcopus ad Scotos Credentes*. therefore the *Scots* were Chriſtians before *Palladius*.

Anſ. If this Teſtimony be adduced to any purpoſe, 'tis to prove, that the *Tramontane Picts* received *Palladius*, their firſt Biſhop from *Cœleſtine*, the *Roman* Pontif, that before that time they believed, and had Presbytery only, but no Biſhops, becauſe *Palladius* was the *firſt*. Now to ſhew the Diſingenuity of this Suggeſtion, it muſt be noted very briefly out of the *Hiſtorical Account*, that by *Scots*, are here meant the *Scots* in *Ireland*; that *Bede* has not a word of their form of Government; that ſome Copies read *ad Scotos convertendos*, which would imply, that they were not yet Chriſtians; that *primus* (in *Proſper*, whence *Bede* is thought to have taken his Narrative) in ſome Copies is read *primitus*, that is, *formerly*; that *Palladius* and *Patricius*, were deſigned for the Primates only, or the firſt Biſhops in rank; and finally, that 'tis true, *Palladius* was the firſt Biſhop, ſent into *Ireland by the Pope*; Yet there were Biſhops before this

De Prim. Time, of which Number Archbiſhop *Uſher* produces Four.
E. B. p. 800. This was the firſt attempt of reducing *Ireland* to the Obedience
801. of the Pope. I'll ſay nothing of Mr. *O*'s confeſſing *Palladius* was ſent into *Ireland*. *Plea* 148.

Plea 152. "Mr. *O.* now promiſes us an Inſtance of Presbyters Ordain-"ing in *Scotland*: 'tis that of *Segenius* a Presbyter, and the Ab-"bot of *Hy*, who with other Presbyters Ordained Biſhop *Aidan* and *Finan*. *Bede* H. E. l. 3. c. 15.

Anſ. But Mr. *O.* acknowledges that there were Biſhops at *Hy*, and in that Province from *Bede*, lib. 3. ch. 4. and the *Ulſter* Annals agree hereunto. What need we ſay any more to reſolve this difficulty? Some Biſhop with the Abbot and his Presbyters, laying hands on (as our Cuſtom is at this Day) Ordained *Aidan*. For to what purpoſe were theſe Biſhops among them, if not to Ordain? The Government was in the Abbots Hands: the Presbyters were able to Miniſter in the Word and Sacraments: The Biſhops buſineſs there was certainly to Ordain.

Mr. *O.* excepts againſt the *Ulſter* Annals, as not being atteſted by any Author of that Age: And yet they agree in moſt things with *Adamnanus*, and with *Bede*, and are a little relied on by Archbiſhop *Uſher*.

Plea p. 153. Mr. *O.* urges (a Biſhop being ſuppoſed in the Monaſtery at *Hy*) *He was ſubject to the Abbot*, and thinks he has here ſufficiently reply'd, to My Lord of St. *Aſaph's* Solution of that difficulty; I do therefore add thereto.

Anſ. Nothing is more certain than that Biſhops were wont to be in Monaſteries. I read in *Theodoret*, of eleven reſiding in thoſe of *Egypt*, from their Youth up to their Extreame Old Age, and when they were Biſhops too.

Theod.

Theod. E. H. l. 4. ch. 22. Now though the Biſhops of the Province were ſubject to the Abbot of *Hy*, yet it muſt remembred alſo, that the Abbots Juriſdiction extended it ſelf throughout the Province. No wonder then, if the Provincial Biſhops were ſubject to the Abbots: Rule and Order required thus much. If one of our *Engliſh* Biſhops ſhould retire into a College of *Oxford*, and admit himſelf a Member of the Univerſity, He becomes thereby ſubject unto the Head of that College, and to the Chancellor within the Precincts of the Univerſity. And that I may not fain a caſe, ſome of our Biſhops have held a Prebendary of a Collegiate Church in *Commendam*: He is thereby ſubject to the Dean therein, all matters belonging to that Church, even as *Bede* ſays, the Provincial Biſhops were to the Abbots of *Hy*, *viz.* within the Abbot's Juriſdiction. But we know for all this the Chancellor of *Oxford*, and the Dean of a Cathedral cannot Ordain. Beſides, the Abbots of *Hy*, though they retained an External Government over all in the Province, the Biſhops not excepted: Yet as to the Epiſcopal and Miniſterial Acts of Religion, in that Age belonging to Biſhops, the Abbots gave place to Biſhops, as will appear from the following ſtory, in My Lord of St. *Aſaph*, "It was it ſeems "the Cuſtom at that time, for the Prieſts being "all equals to break the Lord's Bread in the Euchariſt "together. A certain Biſhop being then at *Hy*, and not diſcovering his "Character, was by *Columba* invited to break the Lord's Bread with "him: But *Columba* at length diſcerning him to be a Biſhop, would have "the Biſhop break the Bread alone, as Biſhops then uſed to do: which ſhews that notwithſtanding the Abbots Temporal Juriſdiction (as I may call it) *Columba* acknowledged the Epiſcopal Order, to be Superior to that of a Presbyter. Laſtly, *Bede's inſolito more* (for the right underſtanding whereof, I refer to the *Hiſtorical Account*) implies, that this was but one ſingular, and unprecedented example. One Swallow, and ſuch a one as was never ſeen before, does not make a Summer. One might then here juſtly cry out with *Jerom*, *Quid mihi profers unius Eccleſiæ conſuetudinem? Cum clingat Turba Eccleſiaſtica*, and the Whole World was Epiſcopal.

Hiſt. Account p. 101. 102.

H. E. l. 3. c. 4.

The firſt perſon ſent into *Northumberland*, from *Hy* was one deſcribed only, but without a Name in *Bede*. Returning back to *Hy* without ſucceſs, *Aidan* is appointed and Ordained unto the Epiſcopacy: in whoſe Ordination it is probable his Predeceſſor, a Biſhop was concerned: for he was then preſent among them. Mr. *O.* alledges, he is called only *Sacerdos* a Prieſt; but this is diſputing a ſmall point by Halves: for if *Aidan* was a Biſhop ſo was his Predeceſſor: And of *Aidan* 'tis ſaid ——*Ipſum eſſe dignum Epiſcopatu*: and then in the next Chapter, *Bede* ſtiles *Aidan* at his Ordination, *Reverendiſſimus Antiſtes*. So then in *Bede*'s Language *Antiſtes* is a Biſhop, and the nameleſs Perſon we ſpeak of is called ſo a little before: He was therefore a Biſhop, if *Aidan* was. Laſtly, *Aidan* beſides was a Presbyter before he was Ordained Biſhop of *Northumbria*: if ſo, to what purpoſe was he Ordained, if not to a diſtinct Office? I do ſuppoſe all Mr. *O's* material Objections are accounted for by this time, and his Proofs of Presbyterian Ordination invalidated. I will conclude this Chapter with two Obſervations.

Ib. lib. 3. c. 5.

Firſt, It cannot with any reaſon be imagined, but that there were Biſhops in the Province of *Hy*, becauſe *Columba*, the firſt Abbot thereof came out of *Ireland*; there we read of Biſhops among whom he was educated, convers't freely with them, and was Ordained by them. He was Ordained Deacon by *Finian* Biſhop of *Meath*, and was an Intimate Friend of *Columbanus* Biſhop of *Laghlin*, and Ordained Presbyter by one of them, moſt probably by *Columbanus*, from whom alſo he might take his Name, as *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Caeſarea*, did that of *Pamphilus*, *Hiſt. Account* c. 5. After he was Abbot of *Hy*, he propagated Biſhops among the *Northumbrians*, from whom our *Engliſh Saxons* derived. On this account it was my Lord of St. *Aſaph* argued, that the *Scotch* Ordinations muſt needs be Epiſcopal, meaning thoſe at *Hy*: which he confirmed by this Conſideration, becauſe the *Romans* (*Auſtin* the Monk, and his *Aſſociates*) did not diſlike the Orders, that they found in the *Britiſh* Church, as being Epiſcopal, though derived from the Monaſtery of *Hy*.

Plea p. 156. To this Mr. *O*. excepts, *that if by* Britiſh *Biſhops be meant the Church of South* Britain, *'tis not to the purpoſe as we obſerved before*.

Anſ. Nothing is more plain than that my Lord Biſhop meant the Church of South *Britain*. Whatever Mr. *O*. obſerved before is not Material, but my Lord Biſhop's Obſervation is manifeſtly to the purpoſe. For if the *Romans* did not diſlike the Orders of the Church of South *Britain*, they could not diſlike the Orders of *Hy*, becauſe the South *Britains* derived their Orders from *Hy*, and doubtleſs were the ſame: and the reaſon they diſliked neither was becauſe they were Epiſcopal, as were the *Romans* and all the World beſide.

" Mr. *O*. adds, if the Orders conferred at *Hy*, be intended as not diſliked by " the *Romans*, yet (ſays he) the *Romans* were not ſo ignorant of the Privileges " of Abbots as to diſlike their Ordinations, which are allowed by that Church. " *Decret. Greg. Abbas, ſi ſit* Presbyter, conferre *poteſt Ordinem Clericalem*.

Anſ. *Ordo Clericalis* may poſſibly here ſignifie neither the Epiſcopal nor Presbyterial, nor the *Diaconal* Order, but the Inferior Orders only, ſuch as the Sub-Deacons, *Acoluthiſts*, *Exorciſts*, *Pſalmiſts*, *Lectors* and *Door-keepers*. But that the Epiſcopal Order is not meant, is to me paſt diſpute: For the *Romans* never allowed an Abbot Presbyter to Ordain a Biſhop that I heard of.

Secondly, If this Privilege was allowed by the *Roman* Pontifs to the Presbyter, Abbots. It was allowed to ſuch of them only, who 'tis likely owned the Juriſdiction of the *Roman* See. But not unto thoſe, who refuſed ſubjection to it, as did the Abbots of *Hy*, Mr. *O*. knows very Well. This Privilege then, whatever it was, could not be the reaſon of the *Romans* not diſlikeing the foreſaid Orders.

Thirdly, The Decretals mentioned were made or put together, by *Gregory* the Nineth Pope of *Rome*, in the Thirteenth Century, about 700 Years after theſe Abbots of *Hy*, almoſt as many after *Auſtin* the Monk, and therefore not appoſitely here alledged.

Fourthly, Mr. *O*. ſeems here to countenance Presbyterian Orders, by Popiſh Indulgences, and Canons framed in the Dregs of Time, when the *Romiſh* Corruptions were at their Height. But I like them never the better for that. The *Romans* are more excuſable in this then our Diſſenters. 'Twas their Principle, that all Church-Officers derive from, and depend meerly upon the Pope's Will. He may then communicate the Priviledge to whom he will, even to a Deacon.

Deacon. But that a Preſbyterian Diſſenter ſhould juſtify his Orders by a Pope's decree is ſomething extraordinary and Extravagant, as I fancy. But

Secondly, I would obſerve that *Columba* a Presbyter himſelf uſurp't (or received from the Prince of the Province of *Deiried*) a Dominion over a great Province in the North-Weſt of the now *Scotland*, over the Monks and *Culdees* (if any ſuch were), yea even over his Fellow Presbyters themſelves: for all or many of them at leaſt were Presbyters, and laſtly, over the Biſhop alſo, if it will be acknowledged there were ſuch in the Province of *Hy*. Beſides, he yet retained a Juriſdiction over the Monaſtery of *Dearmach* in *Ireland*, which himſelf had formerly erected, and his Succeſſors over many more Monaſteries of leſſer Note, which ſprang out of theſe two, both in *Britain* and in *Ireland*. Bede *E. H.* *l.* 3. *c.* 4.

Now this is a wonderful piece of Antiquity to juſtifie the Principles, and Practices of the United Brethren at preſent amongſt us. If it proves Presbyterian Ordination it deſtroys Presbyterian Parity, unleſs Mr. *O.* will aſſert, that the Monks of *Hy* were equal to the Abbots, and that every Monk was the Abbot in his Turn, *pro Tempore*. What Room then has Mr. *O.* to talk of Biſhops receiving their Power from Kings, ruling over many Churches and Congregations, exerciſing Juriſdiction over their Fellow Presbyters (as he thinks) and that for life too? All this did *Columba* and his Succeſſors, who are pretended by Mr. *Baxter*, to have reſtored the *Culdees* (or Presbyters) ſtrength againſt the incroachments of *Palladius*. But all this while the Tyrants only were changed, not the Tyranny, the name altered not the thing. Inſtead of *Palladius*, the *Culdees* and Monks were in the Hands of *Columba*: and in the place of a Biſhop was ſet up an Archpresbyter. Moreover, I would ask whether in the ſuppoſed Ordinations at *Hy* by Presbyters, the Monk-Presbyters could or did Ordain without the Abbot-Presbyters. If not (as I believe all will and muſt grant) our United Bretheren will find little relief from this rare Inſtance of Presbyterian Parity and Ordination.

I ſhould here have concluded this Chapter, but Mr. *O.* in the midſt of this Controverſie, has interwoven an invidious Reflection upon Epiſcopacy, and aſſerted, that the Hierarchy in the Churches of the *Roman* Empire, had their Platform from the Heathen, who had their Flamens and Arch-Flamens, and I know not what. Plea *p.* 149.

Anſ. 1. If the Heathens had Sundry Officers in the Adminiſtrations of their Idolatrous Religion, ſubordinate to one another, it will not follow the Chriſtians took it from them? Why not from the Jewiſh Hierarchy? His beloved *Hilarius Sardus* is of this Opinion: or why may it not not be thought a piece of Natural Religion, wherein the Patriarch, Jews, Gentiles, all agree? But let us ſee how he attempts to make good this Reflection of the Chriſtians deriving their Hierarchy from the Heathen. He grounds it on the Epiſtle of *Julian* to *Arſacius*, the Gentiles Chief-Prieſt in *Galatia*, and after the Citation of a ſcrap out of *Euſebius*, which I do not find in the places directed to, cries out, *Here is a Precedent for Biſhops intermedling with ſtate affairs.* Whereas any one may know that will but read, or underſtand that Epiſtle (which Mr. *O.* never did I preceive) that 'tis intirely ſpent about Religious matters, and directs how *Arſacius* the Chief Prieſt ſhould behave himſelf, in Governing the affairs of the Gentile Religion. Thus we are wont to be teazed by a ſort of Men, that do not or will

not

not underſtand what they ſay ; who, ſo they may caſt dirt upon us, care not how ignorantly and falſly they do it. But to let this paſs. The Queſtion here is, whether the Chriſtians derived their form of Church Government by Biſhops from the Gentiles, or the Gentiles from them. This latter I undertake to make out. *Firſt*, From the Ancient Writers of the Primitive Church, who argue for the Divine Authority of Biſhops, as being borrowed from the *Levitical* High Prieſts, Prieſts and *Levites*. All the World knows this ; I need not bring forth any Teſtimonies, even Mr. *O's* ſo oft mentioned *Hiſtory* is one : but of this I have ſpoke before. *Secondly*, Although the *Druids* according to *Cæſar*, had ſuch a ſort of Government among them yet in the Eaſt, where Epiſcopacy was firſt eſtabliſhed, the Gentiles had no ſuch Government, as appears from what *Euſebius* has noted, of *Maximinus* the Heathen Emperor, who obſerving the way of Church Government among the Chriſtians, and believing it conduced to the furtherance of their Religion, for the ſame reaſon appointed the ſame among the Gentiles. He then drew his Pattern from the Chriſtians. Which is moreover confirmed by *Lactantius*, to have been then newly taken up by the Heathens——*Maximinus novo more Sacerdotes Maximos per ſingulas Civitates ſingulos ex Primoribus fecit——ponere ; hoc ſuis, uſi etiam Provinciis ex altiore Dignitatis gradu ſingulos quaſi Pontifices ſuperponeret*——*Maximinus* then firſt (*Novo more*) created Chief Prieſts in every City, and as if this had been too little, he Ordained as it were High-Prieſts over Whole Provinces : It was then a new device among the Gentiles ; firſt ſet up by *Maximinus* in conformity to the Chriſtians. *Thirdly*, The ſame is proved out of that very Epiſtle of *Julian*, to *Arſacius* the chief-Prieſt of *Galatia*, though quoted by Mr. *O.* himſelf, as if it were on his ſide. I am aſhamed any Man, that pretends to Religion and Learning, ſhould thus foully miſrepreſent Authors, and make as if they had written, what is manifeſt they never ſo much as dreamed of. To ſhew this, I'll firſt ſum up what *Sozomen* himſelf relates concerning this matter, and then give you an abridgement of *Julian's* Epiſtle, that follows in the ſame Chapter. He ſays——" The Emperor (*Julian*) deſiring that the Gentile Religion ſhould prevail, but obſerving " that it was far ſurmounted by the Chriſtian, was exceedingly " troubled. When he thought with himſelf, that Chriſtianity was chiefly commended by the lives and manners of thoſe, who profeſs'd it, he determined " with himſelf, to adorn the Temples of the Gentiles with the ſame Rule and " Order, which was in uſe among the Chriſtians : *alſo with the ſame degrees and* " *Prerogatives of Supremacy.* And ſundry other things are mentioned, wherein *Julian* was reſolved to imitate the Chriſtians : He adds in general—" The " Emperor endeavoured to conform the Gentile unto the Chriſtian Inſtitutions. Then follows *Julian's* Letter to *Arſacius*, the Chief Prieſt of *Galatia*, wherein there is not a Syllable of State-Affairs (as Mr. *O.* has falſly ſuggeſted), not a word that intimates, as if the Chriſtians derived their Government from the Gentiles. " He only admoniſhes *Arſacius* to take care about Sundry, particular things belonging unto Morality, ſuch as Hoſpitality to Strangers, care " about burying the dead, that the Flamines ſhould not frequent the Theater, " nor Drink in Taverns, nor profeſs any Trade. He adviſes him to build Hoſ-" pitals

Lib. 8. c. 14.
L. 9. C. 4.

de morte Perſ. c. 36.

Sozom. *l.* 5. *c.* 16.

“pitals for the Poor, and promiſes to furniſh him with Moneys to do it: He
“wants him not to pay viſits often to Great Men, but to write to 'em only,
“and live retiredly: that the Inferior Flamines ſhould not meet ſecular Of-
“ficers, when they entred the Cities in Pomp, until they came to the Temples
“of the Gods; who when they are entred, are then but private Perſons.
“In a Word, he Orders Arſacius to endeavour to make the Flamines good Men,
“by ſhaming them unto their Duty or perſwading them, or removing them
“from the Prieſtly Miniſtry: to beſtow Honour on them who obey'd, but the
“the ſtubborn and contumacious to expel. Firſt, From the Whole it appears
that all this Policy of Julian was taken from the Chriſtians, whoſe Rules and Go-
vernment he knew very well, having himſelf once been a Chriſtian, and a Rea-
der in the Church. True! many Writers of latter Ages have taught, that the
Chriſtians followed the Gentiles in their Church-Government. But 'tis not my
buſineſs to account for the dreams and fancies of School-Men, and other Au-
thors that follow them: Although at the ſame time I am of Opinion, that
the Primitive Church regulated their Pariſhes, Dioceſſes and Provinces, accor-
ding to the Diviſions, which they found ready made to their Hands, by the Ci-
vil Magiſtrate, and perhaps to the diſtricts formerly appointed by the *Druids*
in theſe Weſtern parts, which might occaſion thoſe Authors to affirm, that the
Epiſcopal Government it ſelf, was borrowed from them, which is (we ſee) a
great miſtake. To conclude; ſeeing we have found the Government of the
Gentile Religion (in the Eaſt at leaſt) was taken from the Chriſtians, being
before more like unto the Preſbyterian or Congregational, the Reflection may
be retorted upon our Adverſaries, and it may with more Truth be ſaid, that
they had their Pattern from the Gentile Prieſts. If any one deſire a more full
and Learned account of this, let him conſult the late Biſhop of *Worceſter*. Antiq. of Brit. Churches c. 2.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning Fortunatianus *Biſhop of* Aſſuræ, Baſilides *and* Martialis *two* Spaniſh *Biſhops.*

MR. *O.* endeavours to prove that Preſbyters, and People may receive an accuſation againſt their own Biſhop: Def. p. 21.
which is as much as to ſay, the Biſhop is not Superior to his Preſbyters, who are
his Judges. This he pretends to evince from the 65th Epi-
ſtle of St. *Cyprian*, which is thus directed——*Epicteto fratri* Edit. Ox.
& plebi. The caſe was this: *Fortunatianus* Biſhop of *Aſſuræ*,
had Sacrificed unto Idols in the late time of Perſecution, under *Decius* the Empe-
ror, by Conſequence he had abandoned his Biſhoprick, and even Chriſtianity

its

its ſelf. When affairs were afterwards ſomewhat ſettled, and Peace reſtored unto the Church, *Fortunatianus* claim'd his Biſhoprick again, and 'tis not unlikely, but he had ſome intereſt among ſome of the People of *Aſſuræ*, who were willing to accept him; for ſo it was I find, in the following Caſe of *Baſilides* and *Martialis*. *Cyprian* acquainted herewith, in that Letter exhorts *Epictetus*, and the People not to receive him, nor to acknowledge him any more for their Biſhop. How this ſtory eſtabliſhes Mr. *O*'s Propoſition, I am not able to diſcern. For *1ſt*, By this Argument the Bps were ſubject unto the People, as well as to their Presbyters, which Mr. *O.* would do well to conſider of. *2ly*, It does not appear that *Fortunatianus* was ever accuſed or cited to Anſwer unto the Charge laid aginſt him: by conſequence no Judiciary Sentence was pronounc't upon him. The Fact was Notorious. He had of his own accord abdicated and turned to the Gentiles. *Thirdly*, If *Fortunatianus* was formally cited, accuſed and condemned, it follows not that *Epictetus* the ſuppoſed Presbyter, and the People were his Judges. One may with more reaſon imagine that the Cauſe was brought, if at all, before the the Provincial Biſhops, and by them decided. *Fourthly*, Its not certain that *Epictetus* was was a meer Presbyter: for ought any one knows or can ſay to the contrary, *Epictetus* filled the Epiſcopal Chair at *Aſſuræ*, when *Cyprian* wrote that Epiſtle. *Fifthly*, Suppoſing *Epictetus* was only a Preſbyter, yet here is no mention of a formal Proceſs or Judgment given againſt *Fortunatianus*: but only a caution given to that Church, not to receive him again. For the matter of Fact (I ſuppoſe) was plain. The unfortunate Man had Sacrificed, and thereby abandon'd his Biſhoprick. But Peace being reſtored, he will needs intrude into it again, having (as is to be preſumed) ſome Friends at *Aſſuræ* favouring his pretences. This is certain the deſign of St. *Cyprian* in this Epiſtle, was not to adviſe them, to call *Fortunatianus* before them to try, and to condemn or depoſe him, but only to warn the Church of *Aſſuræ*, to think no more of their former Biſhop, who had fallen into Idolatry, and was therefore no Biſhop at all. And this was agreeable to the Rule, which the Churches of *Rome* and of *Africa*, and of the Whole World had formerly made, as the Learned *Annaliſt* has obſerved—*That ſuch as had Sacrificed ſhould be deprived of their Ordination and Sacerdotal Honour, and upon their Repentance ſhould be admitted unto Lay Communion only.* The Obſervation is taken out of the 67th Epiſtle (of which I am to ſpeak by and by) in theſe Words—*Jampridem nobiſcum & cum omnibus omnino Epiſcopis in toto mundo conſtitutis, etiam Collega noſter* Cornelius *Sacerdos pacificus ac juſtus, ac martyrio honoratus decreverit ejuſmodi homines ad pœnitentiam quidem agendam poſſe admitti, ab Ordinatione autem Cleri atque ſacerdotali honore prohiberi.* It is not then to be denyed, but that as the Presbyters and the People of a Dioceſs (when 'tis Notorious that their Biſhop has Apoſtatized, and fallen into Idolatry, and for ſome time deſerted them, and another is ſubſtituted in his place (which was I preſume the Caſe before us) have a Power by the Law of Reaſon, and of Scripture too to refuſe him, when he offers to obtrude himſelf again upon 'em; ſo more eſpecially ſince there is a ſolemn Eccleſiaſtical Law provided in the Caſe. But I demand of Mr. *O.* to give me an inſtance, when ever the Presbyters and People called their Biſhop in to Judgment before them, cenſured and rebuk't, acquitted or condemned him, either when the Fact was in Queſtion, or the matter objected againſt him, was in Controverſy about its lawfulneſs. Until Mr. *O.* produces an Inſtance of one

Annal. Cyp. p.16.

of

of theſe Words, he is far ſhort of proving that Preſbyters, and People may receive an accuſation againſt their Biſhop, as *Timothy* had Power to do againſt Elders. For *Timothy* had Power to receive an Accuſation upon information of Witneſſes, and to rebuke the offender accordingly, and if need were to reject him, *Titus* 3. 10. We are then ſafe as yet, notwithſtanding any thing St. *Cyprian* has written in this Epiſtle.

The Caſe of *Baſilides* and *Martialis*, is much what the ſame, as that of *Fortunatianus*, and is to be found in the 67*th* Epiſtle of St. *Cyprian*. 'Twas wrote by St. *Cyprian* in his own name, and in the name of 36 other *African* Biſhops to *Felix* Presbyter, and the People of *Leon* and *Aſturia*, alſo unto *Lelius* Deacon, and the People of *Emerita*, all in *Spain*, in anſwer to a Letter of *Sabinus*, Succeſſor to *Baſilides*, and of another *Felix* Succeſſor of *Martialis*, whom the Biſhop calls *Coepiſcopus Noſtros*, our fellow Biſhops. What may fairly be Collected from this Epiſtle follows; As *Firſt*, It may from this Epiſtle be gathered, that *Baſilides* and *Martialis*, after they had been proved guilty of Idolatry were depoſed from their Biſhopricks. *Secondly*, That *Sabinus* and *Felix*, were ſubſtituted in their Rooms. *Thirdly*, That the Idolatrous Biſhops were deprived, and the new ones Choſen and Ordained, by the Provincial Biſhops in the Preſence, and with the Concurrence or conſent of the People: For thus *Cyprian* ſpeaks—"The People have Power either of chuſing good Biſhops or refuſing unworthy ones: *Again*, the People ought to ſeparate from a Wicked Biſhop: that Epiſcopal Ordinations ought to be Celebrated *ſub populi aſſiſtentis Conſcientia*, with the knowledge and aſſent of the People preſent, to the end that by the People the Crimes of bad Men may be detected, the Merits of good Men may be teſtified, and ſo a right and regular Ordination may be made, which ſhall have been examined by the judgment and ſuffrage of all. *St. Cyprian goes on*——That is to be obſerved, which is held among us in *Africa*, and almoſt in all Provinces, that to the end Ordinations be rightly made, all the next Biſhops of the ſame Province meet together with the People, for whom the Biſhop is deſign'd; and let the Biſhop be choſen in the preſence of the People, which knows and has been acquainted with the Lives and Converſations of the Candidates. This we underſtand has been done among you, in the Ordination of *Sabinus* our Collegue, how that the Biſhoprick was given him, and hands laid on him with the Suffrage of the whole Fraternity, and by the Judgment (or decree) of the Biſhops, who were preſent at the Meeting, and who had ſent their Letters (of Conſent) concerning the Biſhop to be choſen. That which I would deduce from all this is, that becauſe the Power of chuſing and Ordaining a Biſhop, was lodg'd in the Provincial Biſhops together with the People of the Dioceſs, it muſt follow that the Power of depriving, conſequently of receiving Accuſations againſt the Biſhop, was veſted in the ſame Provincial Biſhops, and and the People of the Dioceſs. And if this be ſo, then *Baſilides* and *Martialis* were depoſed by the Provincial Biſhops, in the preſence and with the Conſent of the People, and ſo Mr. [illegible]'s inference from this ſtory will not hold, *ſc*: that the Presbyters and People may receive an accuſation againſt their Biſhop, that's to ſay in a Judiciary way. Moreover it ſeems to me very probable by ſome paſſages in this Epiſtle, that the People's Power in chuſing or rejecting their Biſhop conſiſted only in the Teſtimony, which they gave to the Provincial Biſhops, con-

Edit. Oxon.

cerning the Lives and Converſations of the Biſhop propounded by the Provincial Biſhops to ſucceed. I gather this from those words —— *quando ipſa habeat poteſtatem vel eligendi dignos ſacerdotes, vel indignos recuſandi*, &c. which is more clearly explained in the ſame Paragraph, Where *Cyprian* adds, *Ordinationes ſacerdotales non niſi ſub populi aſſiſtentis Conſcientia fieri oportere, ut plebe præſente, vel detegantur malorum crimina vel bonorum merita prædicentur*. "Ordinations ought to be "with the knowledge of the People, that the Crimes of bad Men might be diſ-"covered, and that the deſerts of good Men, might be made known unto the "Provincial Biſhops, who were indeed the proper Electors. The ſame is ſhortly after again explained—— *Epiſcopus deligatur Plebe Præſente, quæ ſingulorum vitam pleniſſime novit, & uniuſcujuſq; actum de ejus Converſatione perſpexit*——" Let "the Biſhop be choſen (by the next Biſhop of the Province) the People being "preſent, who knew the lives of each (Candidate), and ſaw every Man's Works "and Converſation. So that the Peoples buſineſs ſeems but to have been only to give teſtimony for or againſt the Candidate for the Biſhoprick, whilſt the Synod of the Provincial Biſhops choſe and Ordained him. However this be, it is manifeſt from the whole—— that the Presbyters and the People did not (without the Provincial Biſhops) by virtue of their own ſole and proper Power hear, or receive Accuſations in a Judiciary way, much leſs take upon 'em to give Sentence upon their own Biſhops, which is the thing affirmed by Mr. *O.* without any ground or Reaſon produced out of theſe Epiſtles.

Whoever will impartially read St. *Cyprian*, muſt confeſs he is intirely Ours. Among all others, he is the moſt hearty and Zealous Aſſertor of Epiſcopacy, tho' he uſed and exerted his Power with exemplary Humility and Moderation.

The Rector in *T. N.* obſerved, that in the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, no ſhare in the Government of thoſe Churches was given to the Presbytery, whereby is ſignified at leaſt, that theſe two were the Supreme or Principal Rulers of thoſe Churches committed to their Charge. After this the Rector granted, nevertheleſs, that the Presbyters were not, ought not to be utterly precluded from all intereſt in the Government of the Church, as appears from the Council of *Jeruſalem*, *Acts* 15. Hereunto after ſome Cavils, and charging me with contradicting my ſelf (I leave that to the Judgment of the Reader) the Miniſter gravely admoniſhes us——, *that* Cyprian *did nothing without the Council of his Presbyters, and without the Conſent of the People*. Epiſtle 6. Eraſm.

Anſ. 1. This Paſſage proves not that the Presbyters were equal unto St. *Cyprian*: it may as well be ſaid the People were equal both to the Presbyters and to St. *Cyprian*. All that can hence be gathered is, what I intimated and granted before, that the Presbyters have a ſubordinate ſhare in the Government, and are as a ſtanding Council to the Biſhop: but the Biſhop is the Supreme and Principal. 'Tis ſo in our Civil Government, eſpecially when we have a Wiſe and Good King. He does nothing of moment without the advice of his Peers, and Conſent of his People in Parliament.

2. It may be queſtioned, whether St. *Cyprian* thought himſelf in ſtrictneſs obliged to this, or whether it was his own Voluntary and prudent Reſolution, and Condeſcention unto his Presbytery and People. The whole paſſage runs thus—— *Solus reſcribere nihil potui, quando à primordio Epiſcopatus mei ſtatuerim nihil ſine conſilio veſtro* (Presbyterorum) *& ſine conſenſu plebis mea privatim ſententia gerere*. Wherein is intimated,

Cyp. Ep. 14. Edit. Oxon.

intimated, that he took this Courſe not as obliged thereunto by any Law, but by a Rule he had of his own accord laid down to himſelf, and ſo would not without neceſſity depart from it. For

3. St. *Cyprian* did take upon himſelf ſometimes on extraordinary Occaſions, to diſpatch ſome Eccleſiaſtical Affairs without the Conſent of his Presbyters, and People, (as in the Ordination of *Aurelius* the Lector) which notwithſtanding were valid. Cyp. Ep. 38.

4. The Council and Conſent of the Presbyters, and People were only required, and admitted in Teſtimony of the Manners, Age, Merits, and Qualifications of ſuch as were to be Ordained (of which we juſt now ſpoke), the Power of Ordination ſtill remaining in the Hands of the Biſhop, as may be *ſeen* in the Epiſtles cited in the Margin. Ep. id. and Epiſt. 44.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Scythians.

MR. *O.* very poſitively after *Blondel* aſſerts that——"The Power of Ordination and Government, was in the Hands of Captive Presbyters under the *Scythians* beyond *Iſter*, for about 70 Years from the Year 260 to the Year 327.

Now if this were as certainly true as *Blondel*, and Mr. *O.* have confidently reported out of the Hiſtorian, it would do them no Service at all: foraſmuch as it is not deny'd but that Chriſtians in Captivity, and under other neceſſities alſo may govern themſelves, and Worſhip God without Biſhops, yea, without Presbyters and without Deacons; ſo our Lord has determined in general, *God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*. But not to inſiſt on this; let us ſee, with what Artifice theſe two Gentlemen have miſrepreſented and corrupted *Philoſtorgius*, on whom they Father the foreſaid Story. To this end I will make him ſpeak *Engliſh*.

"*Philoſtorgius* ſaith, that *Urphilas* one of the Tranſiſtrian *Scythians*, who by the Ancients are called *Getæ*, but now *Goths*, brought over into the *Roman* ſoil a very great multitude of Men, who had been thruſt out of their Native Country for the ſake of Religion: that the Nation of the *Scythians*, formerly embraced the Chriſtian Faith, on the following Occaſion. When *Valerianus* and *Gallienus*, were Emperors, a vaſt multitude of *Scythians* living beyond *Iſter*, Croſs'd that River into the *Roman* Empire, and by their Excurſions infeſted a great part of *Europe*. After that having ſailed over (*the Helleſpont*) into *Aſia*, they invaded *Galatia* and *Cappadocia*. And having made very many Captives, among whom were ſome of the Clergy, they returned into their own Country with much prey. Wherefore thoſe Captives and Holy Men, thus mixt with the Barbarians, brought over not a few of them, unto true Piety Philoſto. l. 2. ch. 5.

"and Godlineſs, and perſwaded them, that inſtead of the Gentile Superſtition "they would embrace the Chriſtian Religion. Of the number of thoſe Cap-"tives were the Anceſtors of *Ulphilas*. This *Ulphilas* therefore was the Leader "of thoſe Holy Men, who lately came out of *Gothia* (or *Scythia*) and was their "firſt Biſhop conſtituted after this manner. When by the King of the *Goths*, he "was ſent Embaſſador with ſome others, unto the Emperor *Conſtantine*, he was Or-"dained by *Euſebius*, and other Biſhops with him, Biſhop of thoſe, who be-"came Chriſtians in *Gothia*, and were now paſt over the River *Danube* into the "Empire this multitude of Refugees, the Emperor plac'd in *Mæſia*, that is, on the *Roman* ſide and Bank of *Iſter*. There is nothing more Material in this ſtory, as 'tis delivered by *Philoſtorgius*. Upon this paſſage then, I obſerve as follows.

Photius Bibliothec. ch. 40. p. 26.

First, That *Philoſtorgius* was by the Ancients noted for an Impudent, Lying, and Impious Hiſtorian; and therefore his Relations not eaſily to be credited, eſpecially in the matter now before us. *Philoſtorgius*'s buſineſs was, to advance the Name and reputation of *Ulphilas* (being a profeſs'd *Arian*, as well as himſelf was) and therefore he remembers that *Conſtantine*, called him *Moſes*, and cauſed him to be Ordained the firſt Biſhop of the Chriſtian *Scythians* or *Goths*. The latter of which, I ſhall by and by ſhew is not true, not in the ſenſe *Blondel* would have it.

Secondly, That *Philoſtorgius* in the foreſaid Relation, is ſingular and by himſelf, none of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians before or after him, making any mention of the things related concerning *Ulphilas*: and this is enough to bring him into ſuſpicion, when he commends *Ulphilas*, as the firſt Biſhop of the *Goths* or *Scythian* Chriſtians.

Thirdly, Not to inſiſt on either of the former Obſervations, but allowing *Philoſtorgius*, to be a faithful Hiſtorian, and taking the matter of Fact as granted, I farther note, that *Philoſtorgius* ſpeaks of *Clergy-Men* in General carried into Captivity, not mentioning the particular Species. So that among the Captivated Clergy-Men, there might be Biſhops, and there might not be Presbyters, for any thing *Philoſtorgius* has ſaid, or Mr. *O.* can tell. It is not to be gathered from him, that *Ulphilas* himſelf was ſo much as a Presbyter, when he firſt went unto *Conſtantine*. *Jeromes* Adverſaries therefore might with as much Truth, and for the Honour of Deacons have hence concluded, that the Power of Government, and Ordination was in the Hands of Deacons in *Scythia*, for theſe 70 Years, as *Blondel* could make his Inference for Presbyters. The moſt probable Conjecture is, that there were ſome of all ſorts, *ſc.* Biſhops Prieſt and Deacons.

Fourthly, I might demand of Mr. *O.* to prove that there was any one Presbyter among thoſe Chriſtian Captives, which ſurely, he will be put hard to do, but in the mean while I'll undertake to demonſtrate, that there was at leaſt one Biſhop in *Scythia*, before *Ulphilas*, viz. *Theophilus*, who was one of the *Nicene* Fathers, and ſubſcribed the Canons of that Council, ſo *Euſebius* Witneſſeth——*alſo the Biſhop of Perſia was preſent at the Synod, nor was there wanting a* Scythian *Biſhop*. *Socrates* names him—*Theophilus who being Biſhop of the* Goths, *and there preſent ſubſcribed the* Nicene-*Council*. *Theophilus* therefore was Biſhop of the *Goths* before the *Nicene* Synod, and was preſent at the Council and ſubſcribed it.

Euſ. l. 3. *Vit. Con.* c. 7.

Soc. l. 2. c. 41.

Therefore

Therefore the power of Ordination, and the Government of the *Scythian* Church was not in the Hands of Presbyters among the Christian *Goths* (or *Scythians*) for about 70 Years, as Mr. *O.* and *Blondel* have affirmed, but in the Hands of Biſhops, or of a Biſhop at leaſt. I add, that ſeeing we find a Biſhop among the *Goths* before the *Nicene* Synod, 'tis but reaſonable to think that Biſhops, or a Biſhop at firſt went along with the Captive Chriſtians into *Scythia*, or that one ſoon followed them thither. I will confirm this Conjecture from that paſſage in *Sozomen*, who informs us that— *it was an Ancient Cuſtom* (ſpeaking of the *Scythians*) *that one Biſhop only govern the Churches of that Province.* *Sozomen* is now writing of the Church-affairs, in the Reign of *Valentinian* and *Valens*, that is about the Year 370. 43 Years after *Ulphilas* had been firſt Ordained Biſhop. Now *Ulphilas* was not long before this time alive according to *Socrates*, and invented the *Gothick* Letters, in the Reign of *Valens*. Without all Peradventure, therefore the *Goths* had Biſhops long before *Ulphilas*. For if there had been but two in all, that is *Ulphilas*, and after him *Vetranio*, then Biſhop, it had been a fooliſh remark of *Sozomen*, to tell his Reader, that it was an *Ancient Cuſtom* among the *Scythian* Chriſtians, that one Biſhop only governed their Province, when as this Ancient Cuſtom, forſooth, had been but of 40 Years continuance from the firſt, and there had been but Two, and the former of them dead but about four Years before. For both *Ulphilas* and *Vetranio* were Biſhops in the Reign of *Valens* *. The ſum is there were Biſhops in *Scythia*, during ſome part at leaſt of the 70 Years mentioned by Mr. *O.* and in all likelihood all that while. I defy Mr. *O.* to ſhew the contrary out of *Philoſtorgius*, or any other Hiſtorian extant. There does remain indeed a ſmall Difficulty to be accounted for, *viz.* How then comes it to paſs, that *Philoſtorgius* calls him the *firſt* Biſhop of the *Goths*, if the *Goths* had Biſhops before him? The anſwer hereunto is eaſy and obvious.

Soz. l. 6. c. 21.

Soc. l. 4. c. 33.

* Soz. l. 6. c. 37. The. li. 4. c. 47.

Fifthly, *Theophilus*, who was preſent at the *Nicene* Synod, was Biſhop of the *Goths* beyond the *Danube* (or *Iſter*): for they came not over the River into the *Roman* Empire, till after the ſaid Synod. Upon their Arrival or at their requeſt, *Conſtantine* allotted *Mæſia* for 'em to inhabit, that is to ſay, that part of the *Roman* Empire which lay to the Banks of the *Danube*, on this ſide the River, and named *Ulphilas* to be Biſhop, and he was the *firſt* Biſhop of the *Ciſiſtrian Scythians* within the *Roman* Empire, and Ordained by *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, tho' *Theophilus* before him had been Biſhop of the *Tranſiſtrian*. So *Socrates*, "Moreover to this Faith even *Ulphilas* himſelf, Biſhop of the *Goths* then firſt conſented. For before that time, "he had imbraced the *Nicene* Faith, following *Theophilus* Biſhop of the *Goths*, "who being preſent had ſubſcribed the *Nicene* Council. So that after all this, it can't be queſtioned, but that the *Gothick* Chriſtians were long before *Ulphilas* governed by Biſhops, although *Blondel* and Mr. *O.* have ſo roundly denyed it without, yea, againſt plain Evidence to the contrary. Upon a farther Search into *Blondel*, I find him acknowledging, what I have before ſpoken of *Theophilus* Biſhop of the *Scythians*; but Mr. *O.* who pretends to improve Arguments, has left this lamer and more imperfect then he found it. Let us then ſee what anſwer *Blondel* has framed againſt *Theophilus* the *Scythian* Biſhop: It is as follows.

Soc. l. 1. ch. 41.

"If

" If we grant *Theophilus* was Biſhop of the *Gothick* Metropolis before *Ulphilas*, we
" will being hereby furniſhed with a ſtronger Weapon juſtifie our Cauſe: For
" they who make to themſelves a Biſhop their Superior, who dare deny them a
" Power of Ordaining Presbyters, which are but their equals.

Anſ. This Argument is grounded upon a Suppoſition, which is not to be allowed of nor can be proved. *Blondel* takes it here for granted, the *Scythian* Presbyters Ordained their Biſhop, *Theophilus* for inſtance. But one may ſurmiſe ſeveral other things with equal probability, any of which will overthrow this wonderful Demonſtration. As 1. It may be ſuppoſed that a Biſhop, or Biſhops were by the *Scythians*, at their Irruption into *Galatia* and *Cappadocia*, carryed Captives into *Scythia*, as was before obſerved; or 2. That ſome Biſhop might follow the Captive-Chriſtians into that Barbarous Country, being firſt Ordained in the Empire. *Theophilus* (which is a Greek Name) haply was ſo made and Ordained their Biſhop, or 3. the *Scythian* Church might ſend one of their own Presbyters to be Ordained by the Imperial Biſhops, as *Ulphilas* after was. For that there was a Correſpondence between the *Scythian* and Imperial Churches is paſt doubt, when we conſider that *Theophilus* Biſhop of the *Scythians*, aſſiſted at the Council of *Nice*. There is nothing in *Philoſtorgius* the only Author of this Tale, that thwarts any one of theſe three ſuppoſitions, or that Countenances *Blondel's* ſurmiſes of the *Scythian* Presbyters Ordaining their own Biſhop. That of *Ulphilas* being the firſt Biſhop, I have already accounted for.

2. If the *Scythian* Presbyters Ordained a Biſhop to preſide over them (ſuppoſing this) it hence follows they thought it neceſſary to have one, and rather then have none choſen in their neceſſity, to conſecrate and Ordain him themſelves contrary to the Ordinary and eſtabliſhed Method, of which they could not be ignorant.

But this is ſaid upon a bare ſuppoſition of the *Scythian* Presbyters Ordaining their Biſhops, which is not proved nor at all probable, as I have ſhewed before. That which appears above board is, that the *Scythians* had a Biſhop, which, ſetting apart meer Conjectures on both ſides, is ſufficient to my purpoſe.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Chorepiſcopi.

THE Occaſion of their Inſtitution, as I conjecture, was either 1. To promote and quicken Converſions in the Countries and Villages ſubject to the City Biſhops; or 2. After believers and Congregations were there made, imployed to be as Suffragans, and Aſſiſtants for the better Government of the Churches. And becauſe it was a Fundamental Law in the Church, that there ought not to be two Biſhops in one Dioceſs, with plenitude of Power (it being impoſſible

impoſſible to ſerve two Maſters) therefore theſe *Chorepiſcopi*, were intirely under the Juriſdiction of the City Biſhops, who were indeed the Dioceſans. There is not any Monument of Antiquity, that I am aware of, from whence we may better underſtand the Nature of theſe *Chorepiſcopi*, than the Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, which I will therefore tranſcribe at length into Engliſh.

"They who reſide in Villages and in the Country, or are ſo *Can. 10. Ant.*
"called *Chorepiſcopi*, although Ordained by Biſhops, it plea-
"ſeth the Holy Synod that they know their own Meaſures, and govern the
"Churches ſubjected to them, and reſt content with that care and Adminiſtration;
"that they conſtitute Readers Subdeacons and Exorciſts, and be ſatisfy'd with
"this Power, not daring to Ordain a Presbyter or Deacon, without the expreſs
"conſent of the Biſhop of the City, unto which both he (the *Chorepiſcopus*) and
"the Country belongs. But let the Country Biſhop be under the Biſhop of the
"City, to which he is Subject.

Now the main Queſtion is, whether theſe *Chorepiſcopi* were real Biſhops Superior to and diſtinguiſhed from Presbyters, and in whom was lodged the Epiſcopal Character and Power. The Affirmative is proved by the following Arguments.

1. I conſider, that the Title of Biſhop and the Power of Ordaining Presbyters, was then acknowledged to be in 'em, which I can never be induced to believe, would have been granted them at that time of Day, if they were meer Presbyters. They were under the ſame Biſhop as the City Presbyters were; How came they to have that Honourable Title beſtowed on them, which the City Presbyters had not? Were the Country Presbyters (ſuch the *Chorepiſcopi* were according to Mr. *O.*) far more Honourable and better deſerving the Title of Biſhop then the City Presbyters were? I can imagine no other reaſon of this, but becauſe they had received the true ſtamp and Character of Biſhops, had an inherent habitual Power to do whatever any Dioceſan could, and more than any meer Presbyter was able to do; Only as yet they were not Dioceſan Biſhops, having no Independent Dioceſſes of their own to Govern, and by conſequence were under ſome limitations, which Dioceſans were not.

2. I remember that by the ſame Council of *Antioch* they were *Can.* 7th allowed to give Pacifick Letters to the Clergy to go into other Dioceſſes, which in thoſe Days the Biſhops only could do, and which was one of the Epiſcopal Prerogatives.

3. Again the 10th Canon of *Antioch* decrees, that the *Chorepiſcopi* although they had received impoſition of Hands by Biſhops, may not dare to Ordain a Presbyter or Deacon; the obvious meaning whereof is, that although the *Chorepiſcopi* were Ordained Biſhops; nevertheleſs, they might not Ordain Presbyters or Deacons without leave from the Dioceſan. If a *Chorepiſcopus* received the real Character or Power of a Biſhop, he might be apt to think and conclude with himſelf, that he might Ordain Presbyters and Deacons, as well as the Dioceſan being of the ſame Order with him. No ſays the Canon; And the Reaſon of this Prohibition is manifeſt, becauſe at preſent he acted only as a Comminiſter and Aſſiſtant in anothers Dioceſs, where he might not exert his Epiſcopal Power without Licence from the Dioceſan, nor could do it without Breach of the Peace and Order of the Church: We have ſomething of this kind even

among

among our ſelves at this day. A Dioceſan Biſhop out of his own Dioceſs, and whilſt he abides in another Dioceſs, can't Ordain Presbyters and Deacons without leave from the proper Biſhop; and ſomething of this Nature I find in the 18th Canon of *Ancyra*, where a Presbyter being ſuppoſed to be Ordained Biſhop for another Dioceſs, but rejected is permitted to return to his former Poſt, but ſtill ſo as to be a Presbyter though retaining his Epiſcopal Honour and Character. One may then be a real Biſhop, and have the habitual Power and Intrinſick Character of a Biſhop, and yet can't put forth the Act and Ordain in another Dioceſs. There is no reaſon he ſhould; it would breed Confuſion.

[illegible] *Chorepiſcopi* were real Biſhops, becauſe they had an equal Right and Authority to aſſiſt, vote, decree, and confirm Canons in Councils as Dioceſan Biſhops had. Divers of them ſubſcribed the Council of *Nice*. It muſt be confeſs'd that meer Presbyters did ſo likewiſe, but it was in the Name and ſtead of their Principals, as their very ſubſcriptions ſhew. Thus *Vito* (or *Victor*) and *Vincentius* Presbyters, and Pope *Sylveſter's* Legates, ſubſcribed the *Nicene* Synod, yet added to their common Names, *Romanus* or *Romæ miſſus*: So in the Council of *Carthage*, Anno 419. two *Roman* Presbyters and Legates of the Pope did— *Philippus* Presbyter, *Legatus Eccleſiæ* Romanæ, *Aſellus* Presbyter, *Legatus Eccleſiæ* Romanæ. But the *Chorepiſcopi* ſubſcribed in their own Names, without mentioning any Delegation at all, and therefore acted by their own proper inherent Authority, and by conſequence were real Biſhops.

Plea p. 141. Having (I preſume) proved, that the *Chorepiſcopi* had the True Epiſcopal Character impreſs'd on them, I come to conſider what advantage Mr. *O.* would make of 'em. In the firſt place from the 10th Canon of *Ant. A. D.* 344 (or 341) he lays it down that——*the* Chorepiſcopi *or Country Biſhops Ordained Presbyters, until they were reſtrained by this Canon.* I agree with Mr. *O.* ſo far, that 'tis very likely, the *Chorepiſcopi* preſumed to Ordain Presbyters in another Biſhop's Dioceſs, until they were prohibited by this Canon. It was neceſſary, they ſhould be reſtrained for the peace and good Order of the Church, from having an uncontroulable Liberty of Ordaining in another Biſhops Dioceſs, and without his conſent. The rule is highly reaſonable and obſerved to this Day. However this be, the Canon will do Mr. *O.* no ſervice, if the *Chorepiſcopi* were real Biſhops, and more than Presbyters, of which I have already produced ſufficient proof. Again Mr. *O.* gathers, that if theſe *Chorepiſcopi* were Biſhops, then it appears that Biſhops were made not only in Cities, but in Country villages. This I grant alſo unto Mr. *O.* but it nothing concerns the Matter in Hand. We muſt Diſtinguiſh between Dioceſan Biſhops, whoſe ſeat and Principal Church was oft-times in Villages, and the *Chorepiſcopi*, who were not Dioceſans, but the *Coadjutors* and *Vicars* of the City Biſhops. Now how far the Delegated Power of a *Chorepiſcopus* extended, no one alive can tell at this Day. 'Tis nothing likely, that it was confined to one Village only, as Mr. *O.* contends, though haply his Ordinary Reſidence, and particular care might be in ſome Country-Town, where he diſcharged the Ordinary Duty of a Presbyter, and on that ſcore may be accounted as a Country Presbyter under the City Biſhop; ſuch as this day is even a Dioceſan Biſhop, who is by *Commendam* poſſeſt of a Rectory in another Dioceſs. He can Act there but as a Presbyter, except he has leave from the proper Biſhop. For ought any thing then that Mr. *O.* ſays or pretends to prove,

prove, the delegated Power of a *Chorepiſcopus* reach'd to more than one or half a dozen Villages.

Well! but Mr. *O.* goes on and tells us, that——— "The Country Villages where "the *Chorepiſcopi* were fixt, were but thinly Peopled with Chriſtians, the Ma-"jority or at leaſt great Numbers of the People being Heathens, by which, "(*he adds*) we may gueſs at the bigneſs of Primitive Dioceſes, which were ſcarce "as large as our leſſer Pariſhes.

Here are divers things ſuppoſed and aſſerted, but nothing proved. 1. 'Tis ſuppoſed that the *Chorepiſcopus*'s Power was confined to one Village or Country Pariſh only; this ought to be made out by Mr. *O.* 2. 'Tis aſſerted, that theſe Country Villages were thinly Peopled with Chriſtians, but that is more than Mr. *O.* knows; and the contrary is more probable, *ſc.* that they abounded with Chriſtians even in the Reign of *Conſtantius*, Son of *Conſtantine* the *Great*, when that Council of *Antioch* was held, and from whence Mr. *O.* makes the Deduction. Beſides 'tis likely, that a *Chorepiſcopus* was never made, but where the Chriſtians were Numerous. In ſhort, how thin ſoever particular Villages were of Chriſtians, yet there being many, very many Villages, all of them having ſome Chriſtians, and a Power over them being committed to the *Chorepiſcopus*, this note of Mr. *O*'s is not very much to the purpoſe. But however from the Premiſes he Collects 3. *That we may gueſs at the bigneſs of Primitive Dioceſes, which were ſcarce as large as our leſſer Pariſhes.* Something of this Nature might perhaps be conjectured, if all Mr. *O.* has affirmed without proof, and conclude'd without Examination were true. But I aſk whether this be not an intolerable piece of Confidence to inſinuate at this rate, that theſe Country Villages were ſeparate, and independent Dioceſes, when as 'tis manifeſt from the very Canon, that they were Appendages of the City Dioceſs, and [illegible] ſubject to the City Biſhop. Here then inſtead of a ſmall Pariſh Biſhoprick, we have found as large a Dioceſs, haply as ours are at this Day.

Mr. *O.* proceeds and affirms, "That the *Chorepiſcopi* are an inſtance of Bi-"ſhops, without ſubject Presbyters; they were but Pariſh Biſhops under Ci-"ty Biſhops. Say then a *Chorepiſcopus* had the charge of one only ſingle Village or particular Congregation, ſpecially allotted to him, which at this day we call a Pariſh (admitting this) yet it follows not, that he was a Biſhop without ſubject Presbyters: probably he had ſome diſtrict of the Dioceſs committed to his particular care and inſpection. The Canon of *Antioch* ſeems to intimate thus much——— "It ſeemed good to the Synod, that the *Chorepiſcopi* "govern the Churches (*in the plural*) ſubject to them, and to content themſelves "with this care, and ſollicitude of conſtituting Readers. But granting they had no ſubject Presbyters, but acted Ordinarily as Pariſh Presbyters, yet they were real Biſhops, and ready upon occaſion to diſcharge the Dioceſans Office, when required, which Presbyters could not. Moreover if theſe *Chorepiſcopi*, were only Presbyters and Biſhops of a ſmall Congregation (as Mr. *O.* has before concluded) why was the caution given them againſt Ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, except it was for other Pariſhes or Churches? For ſurely they did not Ordain Presbyters and Deacons for themſelves. If they did, even ſo they muſt have had Presbyters ſubject to them. In ſhort, they had doubtleſs a delegated

Power from the City or Dioceſan-Biſhop, to Ordain Presbyters and Deacons, [illegible] where and when ever occaſion required?

Def. p. 142. But in the laſt place Mr. *O.* urges, the ſecond Council of *Hiſpalis cap.* 7th which makes the *Chorepiſcopi*, to be one and the ſame with Presbyters.

This Council was Provincial and held in *Spain*, *Anno* 619. which is therefore of no great Authority with me: eſpecially ſince the Argument it inſiſts on, is chiefly drawn from the Eccleſiaſtical Laws of the *Roman* Church. For ſo the Canon concludes [illegible] Nevertheleſs, that I may leave [illegible] that has the appearance of an Argument againſt me, I anſwer, That [illegible] by the [illegible] of the *Chorepiſcopi*, they were [illegible] before and after the Councils of *Ancyra* and *Antioch*, for ſometime) [illegible] not long after [illegible] to make *Chorepiſcopi*. So I read in the Council of *Laodicea Can.* 57. held *Anno* 364. There, and then it was decreed that [illegible] *Biſhops ought not to be made any more in Villages, and in the Country* (underſtand, within another Dioceſs) *but only* [illegible] *in their ſtead*: which [illegible] were but Presbyters intruſted with the Adminiſtration of ſome part of the Epiſcopal Power. But [illegible] obſervable [illegible] is after added, [illegible] (*Chorepiſcopi*) who have heretofore been made, the former Canons of *Ancyra* and *Antioch* [illegible] by them, [illegible] the Conſent of the City Biſhop. Where we ſee plainly a [illegible] is given to that Order of the *Chorepiſcopi* for the future. [illegible] for the making the *Chorepiſcopi* [illegible] in the Country, belonging to another Dioceſs [illegible] Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, and by the ſame Power that it was introduced it might again be annulled. [illegible] the clauſe above mentioned, which ſtill reſerves to the former *Chorepiſcopi* their Powers which had been committed to them by the City Biſhops, ſhews that they had received ſome Character, which a Council could not deprive them of. For otherwiſe the Powers of the former *Chorepiſcopi*, might have been Abrogated, as well as the Order itſelf, intirely aboliſhed for the future. The occaſion of this change made by the *Laodicean* Fathers [illegible] was, that they had by experience found ſome inconveniences and diſorders [illegible] through their *Chorepiſcopi*, who it may be could never be hindred from Ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, in other Biſhops Dioceſſes contrary to all Order and good Rule. Therefore an end was put to them, and in their place were ſubſtituted the [illegible] who I imagine were like our Archdeacons at this Day, and were [illegible] for the Biſhops uſe in [illegible] of his [illegible] But upon no account were to have the Epiſcopal [illegible] had they any [illegible] Ordaining [illegible] with the Biſhops licence. According to [illegible]

Brief. [illegible] *Bishop of Worceſter* obſerves, "That *Lanfranc* firſt
p. 145. "made an Archdeacon with Juriſdiction in his See, that *Thomas*
"Archbiſhop of *York*, firſt divided his Dioceſs into Arch-
"deaconries, and *Remigius* Biſhop of *Lincoln*, his into ſeven Archdeaconries, ſays
"*Henry* of *Huntingdon*. One occaſion hereof was the laying aſide the *Chorepiſcopi*,
"as too much aſſuming unto themſelves.

The

The ſum of what has been ſaid is, that the *Chorepiſcopi* were at firſt real Biſhops, but in [illegible] Dioceſes, where they might put forth ſuch Epiſcopal Acts as were permitted them within ſome certain limited diſtrict, and even Ordain Presbyters and Deacons, when expreſly delegated thereto by the Dioceſan; that they reſided in ſome Country Villages, where their Ordinary and conſtant Work was no other than of Presbyters, and ſo were look'd on as the Dioceſan's Presbyters, which can by no means prejudice their Epiſcopal Character. One may be a Biſhop yet without a Dioceſs, as one may be a Presbyter without a Title to a pariſh. The Council of *Laodicea*, thought fit to put an end unto this Order, ſo did the [illegible] and [illegible] Churches, as alſo the *Engliſh*. [illegible] the [illegible] or Archdeacons might have the Title of *Chorepiſcopi*, for ſome while continued to them being ſubſtituted in their room: but this is no proof, that they were Presbyters at their firſt Inſtitution, when the real Epiſcopal Character was [illegible] on them, though the Dioceſs was yet [illegible] [illegible] them. This is what I thought needful, and enough to be offered in Anſwer to the Difficulties ſtarted about the *Chorepiſcopi*.

As for that Epiſtle to *Damaſus* it ſhall ſuffice to note that 'tis one of thoſe, which are acknowledg'd Spurious, as may be Collected from *Blondel* himſelf, whoſe Judgement is—*quas ſcriptas non eſſe conſtat* [illegible] *Epiſtolis, quarum aliquot* [illegible] [illegible] *Epiſcopis & Archiepiſcopis* [illegible] *in Epiſcopis* [illegible] l. 2. c. 22. l. 3. c. 10. 11. The [illegible] therefore ſuch things particular are Apocryphal. It was [illegible] by [illegible] by ſome, that lived after the Council of *Hiſpalis*, there being a very great Agreement between this Epiſtle and that 7th Canon of the Council, as who ever will read them will confeſs. We ſhall not need therefore to be concerned at any thing brought againſt us out of this counterfeit Epiſtle.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Council of Nice.

MR. O. as if all Antiquity were on his ſide, comes not to argue even from the Council of *Nice* itſelf, in favour of the Power of Presbyters Ordaining, which is a diſcovery ſo new and ſurprizing, that one would ſuſpect the whole Chriſtian Church had been blind above theſe 1300 Years laſt paſt, till he with the help of Mr. *Baxter*, has been pleas'd to open all our Eyes at laſt and to aſſure us——*that the Council of* Nice, *&c.* [illegible] *the Presbyters Ordination by* [illegible] *at Alexandria, as follows*——*Et adhuc* [illegible] *Dei Gratia, & uſuris* (*lege uſibus*) [illegible] [illegible] *ad* [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] *fuit, ſed ſe intra Catholicam & Apoſtolicam Eccleſiam ſuae ab erroris* [illegible] [illegible], *Authoritatem habeant non Miniſtros Ordinandi.* Sir, Mr. O. has taken this Paſſage out of Mr. *Baxter*, and he out of Def. p. 135.

ſome Tranſlator, that did not or would not underſtand the Hiſtorian aright. The Words are part of a Letter wrote by the *Nicene* Fathers, to the Church of *Alexandria*, wherein they give an Account to that Church, of what had been propounded and examined in the Synod, and what had been decreed, and confirmed therein, as firſt, "That the Impiety of *Arius*, and his Accomplices had been brought into Queſtion and condemned, &c. —that as for *Meletius*, it pleaſed the Synod to deal more gently with him (than with *Arius*) viz. that he ſhould remain in his own City, but that he ſhould have no Power to Ordain or to propoſe the names of the *Candidates to the holy Function*; only he might retain the bare Title of his Honour (that is of Biſhop); that thoſe who had been conſtituted (*or Ordained*) by him being firſt confirmed (*[illegible]*) by a more ſolemn and Religious Impoſition of the Hands of the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, might be allowed to joyn in matters properly belonging to them; but that until they had obtained their Honour and Miniſtry again, they ſhould be ſecond unto all thoſe, who in every Dioceſs and Church, have been before propoſed under the Authority of our moſt beloved Colleague, *Alexander*; And moreover, ſhould have no Power to propound the Names of thoſe who are ſubject to *Alexander*, nor in ſhort to do any thing without the Conſent of the Biſhop of the Catholick Church of *Alexandria*."

Soc. l. 1. c. 9.

This is all the *Nicene* Synod wrote concerning the *Meletians* or thoſe, who had been conſtituted (*and Ordained*) by *Meletius*. Here's not a Syllable (of Presbyters or) of *Ordaining Presbyters*; the paſſage may as well, and is to be underſtood of Biſhops, and of Ordaining Biſhops. But for the more diſtinct underſtanding of it, we muſt remember, that *Meletius*, while *Peter* was Patriarch of *Alexandria*, had been Biſhop of *Lycus*, a City in *Egypt*. And *Socrates* ſaith [illegible] that during the Perſecution under *Maximian*, *Peter* abſconding, *Meletius* had taken upon him to conſtitute (or Ordain) Biſhops, which belonged unto the Patriarch to do. 'Tis not indeed doubted, but that he Ordained Presbyters and Deacons alſo; nevertheleſs, his firſt and Principal Crime (as I believe) was his Conſtituting (or Ordaining) Biſhops, which was a manifeſt Invaſion of the Patriarch's Right. And that he conſtituted and Ordained Biſhops is proved by *Valeſius*, out of *Epiphanius*. Nay, the ſaid Learned Annotator Evinces, that *Meletius* conſtituted (or Ordained) Twenty Eight Biſhops, beſides Five Presbyters and Three Deacons, as he gathers from the ſecond Apology, of *Athanaſius* againſt the *Arrians*: from whence he makes no ſcruple to affirm, that *Socrates* in this place ſpeaks chiefly of Biſhops, conſtituted or Ordained by *Meletius*, yet ſo, as that Presbyters and Deacons alſo were [illegible] by him. For (ſays he) *if the Nicene Fathers had herein decreed nothing againſt the Meletian Biſhops, they had left their work very ſlight and imperfect.* Beſides, *Meletius* became Schiſmatical not by Ordaining Presbyters, but by Ordaining Biſhops. Hence *Valeſius* obſerves, that *Meletius* [illegible] *he had uſurp'd the Power of Ordaining, which did not at all belong unto him.* The Power of Ordaining whom? Why not Biſhops? For tho' by this means he was fallen into Schiſm, yet he had certainly (as a Biſhop) Power to Ordain Prieſts and Deacons, but not of Ordaining or Conſtituting Biſhops without the Patriarch's leave. And this was I ſuppoſe

Soc. l. 1. c. 24.

Annot. in Locum.

Ubi Supra.

if

If not his only fault, yet his earthly delight. Wherefore, when the *Ni-*
cene Fathers decreed, that the Perſons who had been confirmed and Ordained
by *Melitius*, might not intermeddle in the confirming (or Ordaining) others,
until themſelves had been confirmed [illegible] by a more Solemn
impoſition of Hands, they muſt thereby mean, that the *Melitian* Biſhops, being
Ordained Schiſmatically, were ſuſpended from Ordaining until they had been
confirmed by the Patriarch, and ſome of the *Egyptian* Biſhops ſubject to him.
And this is all that the Synod declar'd concerning the *Melitians*. But neither
Mr. *O.* nor Mr. *Baxter*, for any thing I can ſee in the *Plea*, have taken any No-
tice of this Paſſage, inſtead whereof we are amuſed with ſomething leſs Pertinent
to the matter in Hand, as I am now about to ſhew. For the *Nicene* Fathers go
on in that Epiſtle to ſpeak of the *Alexandrians*, that is ſuch as had not withdrawn
themſelves from *Alexander* the Patriarch, nor had ever adhered to *Melitius*:
They thus then farther write to the Church of *Alexandria*, concerning theſe lat-
ter and Regular Clergy. τοὺς δὲ &c. "But as for thoſe, who by the Grace of
"God, and through your Prayers have been found in no Schiſm, but have ever
"ſtood firm, and unmoveable in the Catholick Church, it pleaſed the Holy
"Synod, that they ſhould have Power [illegible]
"to point out, and to give up the Names of ſuch as were [illegible]
"worthy to bear the Clergy, and in ſhort, to do all things according to the Ec-
"cleſiaſtical Law and Conſtitution: which is the paſſage miſrepreſented by Mr.
O. and Mr. *Baxter*, wherein the Synod confirms to 'em, their Ancient Rights
and Privileges. Having given I hope, an exact account of this latter part of
that Epiſtle, let us now ſee whether Mr. *Baxter* or Mr. *O.* have done ſo. To
which end I obſerve, that here is not one Word of Presbyters, at leaſt not of
Presbyters Ordaining, and leaſt of all of Presbyters, who had been Ordained
by *Melitius*, nor laſtly (which was the thing Mr. *O.* aimed at) of Presbyters
Ordaining Miniſters. 1. They ſpeak not of Presbyters, that is, not in parti-
cular, and expreſly of them alone, as is manifeſt to any one, that has his Eyes
in his Head: but only in General of ſuch as had not been engaged in the *Meli-*
tian Schiſm. Theſe ſurely muſt be Biſhops, as well as Presbyters or Deacons.
The truth is, they include all the Three Orders, and that's the reaſon in this
whole Epiſtle, they Name no one of them expreſly, meaning to confirm
them all (as well Biſhops as Presbyters, that had ſtuck cloſe to *Alexander*) in their
Ancient Reſpective Powers and Truſts. 2. Much more they ſpeak not of the
Ordaining Power of Presbyters. Mr. *O.* at leaſt ought not to ſay ſo; for what
then will become of the Authority of Father *Eutychius*, who aſſerts, that *Alexander*
or the *Nicene* Council firſt deprived them of it? what did this Synod or *Alexander*
both deprive 'em of it, and confirm it to them? that cannot be. Either then
Eutychius is out in his ſtory, or Mr. *O.* is a little miſtaken about the Letter of the
Nicene Fathers. Beſides, προχειρίζεσθαι does not ſignify to Ordain, but the ſame
as [illegible], in one Word to put up the Names of the Candidates
for Holy Orders, and *Sozomen* in his account of this Fact uſes that ſingle word
[illegible] to *chuſe*, *Socrates* expreſſing it in two Words (as *Valeſius* has obſer-
ved) Exegetical of one another; it being uſual for Authors to embelliſh their
writings, and give them a grateful Emphaſis by a Variety, and redundancy
of Expreſſion. No body at this diſtance of time can tell all the Cuſtoms of this
Church, and what Honorary Privileges the Presbyters might have at the pub-
lick

[illegible] Meletians. [illegible] is not to be [illegible] Ordaining, and [illegible] 'tis not necessary to understand the privilege of Presbyters Ordaining; it may as well be presumed to be intended of [illegible] Ordaining, there being no circumstance that limits the sense to Presbyters; [illegible] these Words are spoken of those [illegible] to the Communion, and not of the Ordainers, and may as well be understood [illegible] were thought worthy to be [illegible], as those who were thought worthy to be [illegible] among the Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, we read of [illegible] least of all. Thirdly as the Nicene Fathers speak here of the Meletian Presbyters, because the Meletians had none, according to the Character here given of those Persons, a fixed firm and unmoveable in the Catholick Church, and had been engaged in the Meletian Schism. Nor so does the Synod speak of Ordaining Ministers, if by Ministers our Adversaries understand Presbyters (which Title they seem at this day to affect, and assign to themselves, though it generally denotes all the Three Orders.) These four mistakes has Mr. O. committed at the beginning of his Account of the Nicene Synod. But [illegible] I proceed to consider what He further advances on this Occasion, I will [illegible] by Note that the Patriarchs of Alexandria had power over the Bishops and Whole Church of Egypt, with its Appendages long before the Synod of Nice. That they had then power over these Churches appears plainly from this Epistle, which in several places speaks of them as subject to the Bishop of Alexandria: that the Alexandrian Patriarchs had Power over them before the Patriarch Alexander is evident from the Meletian Schism, which had not been a Sinful Schism, if Peter and Achillas, Alexander's Predecessors had not had Jurisdiction over them. That this Power of the Patriarchs was very Ancient, is also manifest from the 6th Canon of the Nicene Council, which begins thus—*Let the Ancient Customs which are in* Egypt, Libya *and* Pentapolis, *that the Bishop of* Alexandria *have power over all these Provinces*; which shews fully, the extent of their Power through Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, and that it had been an Ancient Custom, that is, long before Alexander, and the Synod of Nice, yea, before Peter and Achillas. Thus much being said for the right understanding of that Letter of the Nicene Fathers, let us now proceed to examine what Mr. O. has inferred from the last mentioned passage, according to Mr. Anon's Lamentable Translation of it.

Mr. O. argues—"If any say the meaning is, that these Presbyters shall "Ordain and govern with Bishops, but not without them, it is granted. For "the decree refers to the *Evangelical* [illegible]; but this sheweth, that Ordina-"tion belongeth to the Presbyters Office, and consequently it is no nullity, but "an irregularity as to the Canons, when 'tis done by them alone. His meaning is (as I take him) that Presbyters have an Inherent and Intrinsick power to Ordain, but that the Nicene Fathers laid by their Ecclesiastical Constitution restrained that power, so that it should not be exerted, but with the Bishops: that when the Presbyters did Ordain without Bishops, 'twas only an irregularity or breach of the Ecclesiastical Constitution, not a Nullity. But to this I reply,

1. That the Nicene Fathers (as has already been observed) speak not of Presbyters only, but of all the Three Orders Bishops, Priests and Deacons, who are hereby every one of them, allowed to do what properly belongs to their own Order, according to the Ancient Custom and Constitution of that Church.

2. That

2. That therefore ſuppoſing their meaning to be (what Mr. O. would have it) that Presbyters in particular, according to the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, ſhall Ordain with the Biſhops, and not without them, it will not follow, that Ordination by Presbyters alone without Biſhops is valid, and only an Irregularity: Becauſe it may with as good Reaſon be hence concluded, that the Presbyters power to Ordain with the Biſhops belonged to them, but by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution only, and not by any inherent Right. There is nothing in this Letter, that argues any thing for their Intrinſick power to Ordain. The moſt that can be ſaid is, that they had an Antient Right by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, and Cuſtom to Ordain with Biſhops; and if ſo, then their Ordaining without Biſhops, was a Nullity, as well as an Irregularity; becauſe they tranſgreſs'd that very Law which alone gave them their Power. 3. It is a great miſtake, to think every thing eſtabliſhed, or rather reinforc'd by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, has no better Foundation than that very Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution or Reinforcement. A Divine and Scriptural Law may, and has been oftentimes confirmed and renewed by a Synodical Decree, and ſubjected to Eccleſiaſtical Penalties. The Lord's Day, which Mr. O. will not deny to be Holy by Divine Inſtitution, has been made ſo by Humane appointment alſo, and puniſhments decreed againſt thoſe that prophaned it. This is manifeſt among our ſelves here in *England*, and *Conſtantine* Ordained the firſt Day of the Week for Divine Worſhip: Shall we ſay, the Lord's Day was not Holy and Appropriate to Divine Worſhip before that Emperor's Conſtitution? Of the ſame Nature, are the 38. 41. 42. &c. 49. 50. 51. &c. *Can. Apoſtol.* The Decree then of the Synod of *Nice* hinders not, but that it might have been a Divine Inſtitution, that Presbyters Ordain and Govern, only with and under Biſhops. And if this be ſo, as I have formerly ('tis hoped) made good, then Presbyters Ordaining without Biſhops will prove a Nullity, and contrary to the Divine and Scripture Rule, as well as an Irregularity or contrary to the Eccleſiaſtical Laws. But how does the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution ſhew, that Ordination belongs to the Presbyters Office? His meaning (I ſuppoſe) is that the *Nicene* Synod, could not appoint Presbyters to Ordain with Biſhops, except the Presbyters had a Priority and an intrinſick power to Ordain. But I aſk, why may not the Synod ſhew thereby, that the Presbyters intrinſick power (what ever it was) belonged to them only in Conjunction with Biſhops? And not ſeparately from 'em. If a Prince Commands the General of his Army to do nothing of Moment, without the advice of the Principal Field-Officers, this ſhews that the Field-Officers have a Power to Act with the General and under him, but not that they have a power to Act ſeparately and without Him: And if the General or other the Kings Miniſters declare this part of the Commiſſion to the Field-Officers, they may and ought to Act in Conjunction with their General (for the Commiſſion ſo appoints); but it would be preſumption and Mutiny to Act without the General, which if they preſumed to do their Orders would of themſelves be Null and invalid. Briefly Mr. O. muſt firſt prove, that the *Nicene* Fathers ſuppoſed the Presbyters to have an Intrinſick power to Ordain alone, before he can make out that their ſeparate Ordinations are irregular only, and not invalid in themſelves.

But

But Mr. *D.* again argues that—" If it be ſaid theſe (Nicene *Conſtitutions*) "condemn Schiſmatical Ordinations (*which he grants, yet anſwers*) that Schiſm as "ſuch cannot make Ordinations Null, though it implys an Irregularity. Hereunto I return, that Schiſm as ſuch does make the Ordination Null. It is Null as to the Exerciſe of the Office ſo conferred, though not as to the habitual Power or intrinſick Character given. This ſeems to have been the very Senſe of the *Nicene* Fathers, in this their Epiſtle to the Church of *Alexandria*. The *Melitian* Biſhops, becauſe they had been Schiſmatically Ordained, were ſuſpended from the Exerciſe of their Office, yet their Character was not declared utterly void and annull'd. There was Room left for their exerciſing it again upon ſome certain Conditions, and the Title of Biſhop was ſtill continued unto 'em, which could not be, if the Character had been intirely loſt or Null.

Hitherto belongs the Caſe of *Colluthus* and *Iſchyras*, which ſome Epiſcopal Divines have urged againſt the Validity of Ordination by Presbyters; for, ſay they, *Iſchyras* Ordained by *Colluthus* a Presbyter, is in *Athanaſius* conſtantly called and declared no Presbyter, but a meer *Laic*, and not ſuffered ſo much as to have the Honor and Title of Presbyter, tho' all others of the *Melitian* Schiſm, Epiſcopally though Schiſmatically Ordained were allowed: So the *Nicene* Fathers had decreed. The reaſon why *Iſchyras* was rejected is this, he had been Ordained by a Presbyter only, *viz.* *Colluthus*. *Blondel* has taken much pains to perplex this Fact with ſundry difficulties, and Objections thrown in our way on purpoſe to render it uſeleſs unto us in the preſent Controverſie; and Mr. *D.* alſo has made his obſervations on it. I ſhall conſider them both, and to that end ſhall in the firſt place produce the Principal paſſages, that occur in *Athanaſius*'s ſecond Apology relating to the ſaid *Colluthus* and *Iſchyras*. There I read of.

Apol. 2. *Ep. Syn. Alex.* p. 722. *apud Ath.* "*Iſchyras*, who neither was Ordained by the Church, nor, "when *Alexander* received the Presbyters Ordained by *Melitius*, "was reckoned among them (*that is to ſay in* Melitius *his Breviate*), ſo that he was no Presbyter. How then or by whom "was he counted a Presbyter? By *Colluthus*? For that alone re-"mains to be pretended. But 'tis granted on all hands, that *Colluthus* died a "Presbyter, all his Ordinations were void, and all Ordained by him, in the "Schiſm reduced into the Order of *Laicks*——But they (the Euſebians and "Melitians) called a private Fellow Presbyter——*Iſchyras*

Id. p. 735. "was not acknowledged a Presbyter by *Athanaſius*.

Apol. 2. *Ep. Syn. Sard. ad Eccl. Afr.* p. 764. "*Iſchyras* was not ſo much as a Presbyter, he never was a Pres-"byter of *Melitius* (*not Ordained by him.*)

Apol. 2. p. 781. "*Iſchyras* was in no wiſe a Cleric, though the *Euſebians*, and "*Melitians* gave it out, that he was a Presbyter.

P. 782. 'Tis remarkable, that *Iſchyras* in his ſubmiſſive Letter, unto *Athanaſius* diſowned not his being a Presbyter Ordained by *Colluthus*, which I note here by the by.

"*Iſchyras*

"*Iſchyras* our accuſer is no manner of way a Presbyter, be-"cauſe he is not mentioned in the *Breviculum* or Regiſter of "thoſe, who had been Ordained by *Melitius*. [*Ap.* 2. p. 788. 789.]

"*Iſchyras* never was a Miniſter of the Church, but boaſted "himſelf to be a Presbyter of *Colluthus*, though no Body believ-"ed him———ſo that He [redacted] was depoſed by the "*Alexandrian* Synod, and number'd among the *Laics*. [*Ap.* 2. *Ep. Mar. Presb.* & *Diac. ad Curioſum.* p. 792.]

"*Iſchyras* a Fellow, that called himſelf a Presbyter, but was "no Presbyter: for he was Ordained by a Catholick Presby-"ter (*Colluthus*), who himſelf ([illegible]) was "but an Imaginary or Counterfeit Biſhop, and was Command-"ed in the General Council (of *Alexandria*) by *Hoſius*, and the o-"ther Biſhops to be a Presbyter, as he had been before: So "that by conſequence all Ordained by him, went back into their former place, "and *Iſchyras* appeared a *Laic*. [*Ap.* 2. *Epiſt. Maret. Presb.* & *Diac. ad Curioſum*, p. 794.]

"The *Euſebians* and *Melitians* called this Fellow Biſhop, who "was not at all a Presbyter: but they made the Emperor to "write unto *Colluthus* (for nothing comes amiſs to them) that "a Church be provided for *Iſchyras*, and immediatly cauſed "him to be called a Biſhop, when he was not ſo much as a Presbyter: From all which we think the caſe as before ſtated is clear. [*Ap.* 2. *Ep. Syn. Hier.* p. 802.]

"But *Blondel* contends, "That *Colluthus* was a real Biſhop Or-"dained by *Melitius*, though Shiſmatically, which is only a "Canonical Irregularity; but however he was Epiſcopally Or-"dained, and a real though Schiſmatical Biſhop: That if he had "out-lived this ſtorm raiſed againſt him, by the *Alexandrian* Sy-"nod, he muſt have been a partaker of the favour granted to ſuch by the *Ni-*"*cene* Fathers, and by conſequence would have been a Biſhop, though created "Schiſmatically: and therefore that *Iſchyras*, if at all Ordained by *Colluthus*, "was Epiſcopally Ordained, and ſo could not be depoſed for being Ordained "by a Presbyter, but as Schiſmatically Ordained by a Biſhop in Schiſm. The deſign of all which is to wreſt out of our Hands this Weapon, and to make it believed, that the caſe reaches not Ordination by Presbyters: For *Blondel* is very poſitive, and thus expreſſes himſelf———"It is falſe and frivolous to aſſert, "that *Iſchyras* was no Presbyter, ſimply for this one reaſon, that he was Or-"dained by *Colluthus* a Preſbyter: Becauſe *Colluthus* was a real Biſhop, after what "manner created is little to the Point. [*Apol. pro ſent. Hieronymi.* Sect. 3. p. 317. &c.]

In Anſwer hereunto, and to evince that this is a Clever Inſtance in Antiquity againſt Ordinations by Presbyters, I will reduce the Whole caſe into three Queſtions. 1. Whether *Colluthus* was ever Ordained Biſhop by *Melitius*. 2. Whether *Iſchyras* was ever Ordained Preſbyter by *Colluthus*. 3. Suppoſing he was not, whether *Iſchyras* became a *Laic* for want of any Ordination, or becauſe Schiſmatically Ordained by a Schiſmatical Biſhop, or laſtly, becauſe Ordained by a Presbyter only.

Qu. 1. Whether *Colluthus* was ever Ordained Biſhop by *Melitius*.

Anſ. Never.

For he is all along called Presbyter, never Biſhop, nor Schiſmatical Biſhop: He is deſcribed as one, that took upon him the Epiſcopacy, perſonated and pre-

Epist. ad Curiosum. tended to be what he was not, a Biſhop. If he had been a real, though Schiſmatically Ordained Biſhop, he could not have been ſaid παρὰ τοῦτο to have Acted the part of a Biſhop, which implys, he was not really one. No body ever called a real Biſhop, though Schiſmatical a counterfeit or Phantaſtical one, there being a vaſt difference betwixt theſe two. Laſtly, if *Colluthus* [illegible] al Biſhop though Schiſmatical, then *Iſchyras* Ordained by him, ought to have been partaker of the *Nicene* Indulgence, as other *Melitian* Schiſmaticks were; but
Ep. Syn. Alex. ubi ſupra. *Iſchyras was not in the number of thoſe recieved by Alexander*; and therefore *Colluthus* was not a Real Biſhop.

Againſt all this is it will haply be replyed, as *Blondel* has en-
Ap.2,p.789. deavoured to prove, that *Melitius* in his *Breviculum*, preſented unto *Alexander*, owned *Colluthus* as one of thoſe Biſhops which He had Ordained.

Anſ. 1. Here lies the Knavery: For 'tis not *Colluthus*, but *Caluthus*, who is mentioned in the *Breviculum*. And leaſt this ſhould be thought a miſtake in Writing or in Printing, I undertake to prove beyond all Contradiction, that they were different Perſons however, if not different in Name alſo. For 'tis granted by *Blondel*, and in its ſelf manifeſt, that our *Colluthus* died before the Synod of *Nice* broke up, or *Alexander* returned into *Egypt*, and demanded of *Melitius* this *Breviculum*. But the *Caluthus* named in the *Breviculum*, when *Melitius* brought it to *Alexander*, now returned from *Nice* into *Egypt* was then alive: So it follows in *Athanaſius*, immediately after the *Breviculum* τούτους [illegible] Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ. Theſe Perſons then preſent, *Melitius* brought unto *Alexander* the Biſhop. So that, as the Accuſers of *Athanaſius*, pretended he had Killed *Arſenius*, though *Arſenius* was then alive: Even ſo by a contrary Artifice, *Blondel* will have our *Colluthus* alive: Though he was already Dead, whoſoever then were Ordained by our *Colluthus*, were Ordained by a meer Presbyter.

Qu. 2. 2. Whether *Iſchyras* was ever Ordained Presbyter by *Colluthus*.

Anſ. That he was no Presbyter is ſo often affirmed, that we need not trouble our ſelves to enquire farther into that matter. However, that he was Ordained by *Colluthus* (becauſe *Blondel* is inclined to believe not) will require a little proof.

And 1. I note that though *Athanaſius* plainly enough
Ap.2.p.735. denies, he was at all a Presbyter, yet ſtill with reſpect to *Melitius*, who 'tis certain did not Ordain him. *Iſchyras* (ſays He)
Apol. 2. p. 788. 789. *is no manner of way a Presbyter, becauſe he was not mentioned in the* Breviculum, *or Regiſter of thoſe whom* Melitius *Ordained.* This Argument, which he brings here, ſhews *Iſchyras* was not Ordained a Presbyter by *Melitius*: But 'tis no proof againſt *Colluthus* his Ordaining of him, neither did or could *Athanaſius* mean ſo. Thus the
Ap.2.p.764. *Sardick* Fathers, *He never was a Presbyter of* Melitius. 2. *Iſchy-*
Ap. 2. p. 792. 794. *ras* gave out himſelf, that he was a Presbyter of *Colluthus* his Ordaining: The *Arrians* and *Melitians*, called him Presbyter on
Ap. 2. p. 732. 781. that account. 3. Though none but himſelf, the *Euſebians* and *Melitians*, and a few of his Relations, called *Iſchyras* a Presbyter, yet the Orthodox affirm, he was Ordained by *Colluthus*. The Council of *Alexandria*, admitting that he had been Ordained by *Colluthus* conclude, he was no Presbyter, but deny not that he was Ordained by

Colluthus

Colluthus the Presbyter, and for that reaſon *Iſchyras*, though Ordained was indeed no Presbyter. The *Mareotis* Presbyters and Deacons, ſay plainly ——— *He was Ordained by the Catholick Presbyter* Colluthus, who counterfeited Himſelf a Biſhop, and moreover add, *that all Ordained by* Colluthus, and among the reſt, *Iſchyras became and were meer Laics.* 'Tis evident then, that *Iſchyras* was Ordained by *Colluthus*, and yet was not a Presbyter, becauſe *Colluthus* himſelf was but a Presbyter. Ap.2.p.732. Id. p.794.

4. Suppoſing *Iſchyras* was not really Ordained by *Colluthus*, the point will come to the ſame Iſſue: For the *Alexandrian* Synod not troubling themſelves to enquire into the matter of Fact, but taking it for granted, that he was Ordained (it was the ſame thing with them) they pronounced the Sentence againſt Him, that he was not a Presbyter, becauſe he was Ordained by the Catholick Presbyter *Colluthus*, and ſo be- appeared a meer *Laic.* Ap.2.p.732. 794.

Qu. 3. 3. Whether *Iſchyras* was declared a meer *Laic*, either becauſe not Ordained at all, or becauſe Schiſmatically Ordained, or elſe becauſe he was Ordained by a Presbyter only, *viz.* *Colluthus.*

Anſ. It having been proved, that *Colluthus* was no Biſhop, that *Iſchyras* was Ordained by him, at leaſt ſuppoſed by the Synod of *Alexandria*, to have been Ordained by him, the firſt part of the Queſtion is at an end, it was not becauſe he had not been Ordained at all; and then I affirm he became a *Laic*, not ſimply becauſe he was Schiſmatically Ordained, but becauſe he was Ordained by a Presbyter, who had no competent power to Ordain at all. For 1. *Colluthus* is ever called Presbyter (not once Biſhop or Schiſmatical Biſhop that I find) or barely *Colluthus* or Catholick Presbyter, or one that counterfeited himſelf a Biſhop, as in the Synodical Letter of the *Alexandrian* Fathers, and by the Presbyters and Deacons at *Mareota.* They all then looked upon *Iſchyras* as Ordained by a Presbyter, and for that reaſon his Ordination Null. For ſo 2. It is expreſly recorded, *Colluthus died a Presbyter, therefore all his Ordinations were void, and all Ordained by him in the Schiſm were reduced into the Order of* Laics, ſays the Synodical Letter of the *Alexandrian* Fathers. *Iſchyras was no Presbyter, for he was Ordained by the Catholick Presbyter* Colluthus; *ſo that by conſequence all Ordained by him went back into their former place, and* Iſchyras *appeared a* Laic, ſay the Presbyters, and Deacons at *Mareota.*

But it will be objected, that the Words in the *Alexandrian* Synod are——— *all Ordained by* Colluthus *in Schiſm became* Laics, implying by thoſe Words *in Schiſm*, that therefore his Ordinations were void, not becauſe *Colluthus* was a Presbyter, but becauſe his Ordinations were Schiſmatical.

Anſ. 1. It is very true in Fact, that all *Colluthus* his Ordinations were Schiſmatical, yet this was not the proper and immediate reaſon of their Nullity; but only mentioned as a Circumſtance which aggravated his Crime, the True Reaſon, being aſſigned in the former Clauſe of that Period—*Colluthus being a Presbyter died, therefore all his Ordinations were void, viz.* becauſe he died a Presbyter, and for the ſame reaſon thoſe Ordained by him were meer *Laicks.*

2. Schiſm, if it was one reaſon of the Nullity of *Colluthus* his Ordinations, yet it was not the only one: For another was, becauſe *Colluthus* died a Presbyter.

3. I do confeſs the *Alexandrian* Fathers, proſecuted the *Melitians* with the utmoſt Rigor, declaring all their Ordinations without exception utterly void; ſo that ſuch as were Schiſmatically Ordained, were Univerſally Commanded to be what they were before. But the *Nicene* Fathers came to a better Temper, and in ſome Degree confirmed the Schiſmatical Ordinations, that is, ſuch as were meerly Schiſmatical: And yet *Iſchyras* was not permitted to taſt of this favour? Why ſo? Why, becauſe there was another fatal blot in his *Eſcocheon*, which could never be wiped out, *viz.* He had been Ordained by a Presbyter only.

4. It is a great miſtake to think that Schiſm muſt needs be underſtood of the breach of the Eccleſiaſtical Laws only. There is Schiſm in departing from ſome Scripture or Divine Rules, which not immediatly appertaining to the Fundamentals and Eſſence of Religion, denominates the Perſons not Apoſtates or Hereticks, but Erroneous and Schiſmaticks only. If any of the believers at *Antioch*, had preſumed to eat Blood contrary to the Apoſtolical Decree concluded on at *Jeruſalem*, he had been doubtleſs a Schiſmatick. Thus we reckon the Diſſenters Schiſmaticks, as departing from the Divine Apoſtolical Conſtitution of Epiſcopacy. *Colluthus* a Presbyter Ordaining *Iſchyras* did it in Schiſm, true! but 'twas ſuch a Schiſm as contravened a Divine Law, and ſo the *Alexandrian* Fathers thought for any thing I ſee to the contrary, when they condemned his Schiſmatical Ordinations as Null in themſelves. For ſurely that which is done againſt a Divine Law, (and ſuch is Schiſmatical Ordination, Schiſm being a Work of the Fleſh) is in its ſelf Null and of no Effect.

5. We ought to diſtinguiſh between the Law its ſelf, and the Cenſures of the Church declared againſt the breach of that Law. The Law may be of Divine Appointment, though the Cenſure is meerly Eccleſiaſtical. St. *Paul* has given us a Canon, that a Biſhop ought not to be a *ſtriker*: But Depoſition for this fault is purely Eccleſiaſtical, not an Apoſtolical Penalty. In like manner a Presbyter (as *Colluthus*) Ordaining without the Biſhop, and for that cauſe being depoſed, the fault was committed againſt a Divine Law, though the puniſhment was Eccleſiaſtical. 'Twere fooliſh and abſurd to conclude, that Ordination by a Presbyter was only a Canonical Irregularity, becauſe a Synod declares it Null: Or that *Iſchyras* his Ordination was only irregular & uncanonical not unſcriptural, becauſe his Depoſition was decreed by the *Alexandrian* Synod. As it is not the verdict of the Jury, nor the Sentence of the Judge, nor the Execution of the Criminal, which properly and in intrinſick Juſtice makes him a Murtherer, but the Murther its ſelf committed; ſo 'tis not a Synod's Solemn Declaration, which is purely Eccleſiaſtical, but the Schiſm its ſelf or a Violation of ſome Scripture-Law that makes him a Schiſmatick, and ſubjects him to Eccleſiaſtical Puniſhment.

1 *Tim.* 3.3.

Blundel himſelf ſuſpecting (as I believe) that the Whole Fabrick, which he had with ſo much Artifice, and Subtlety here raiſed in Oppoſition to us, would not ſtand, is therefore content at leaſt to grant that——" *Iſchyras* was for this " one reaſon accounted a *Laic*, becauſe he was Ordained by a Presbyter, by " *Colluthus* a Presbyter: But ſays it does not hence follow that Biſhops alone had " power given them by the Apoſtles to Ordain, or that Presbyters were not Origi-" nally inveſted with that Power: And he adds, that nevertheleſs, Ordination by " Presbyters was only a Violation of the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, which he en-

" deavours

" deavours to confirm from numerous Inſtances of Eccleſiaſtical Canons, by Ver-
" tue whereof Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, were ſometimes depoſed for
" Canonical Irregularities.

Anſ. This is a ſorry ſhift and unworthy ſo Learned a Man; for on the other ſide, I am able to produce ſeveral Canons, and have already produced enough, the matter of which Canons is grounded on Scripture, though reinforced by Eccleſiaſtical Penalties. It will not follow then, that becauſe the Eccleſiaſtical Canons forbid Presbyters to Ordain (reſerving that Power to Biſhops) upon pain of Depoſition or Deprivation, &c. therefore this was not a Divine Appointment, but Eccleſiaſtical only. For at this rate *Blondel* might pretend the 27th Canon Apoſtolical, the matter of which is, *that a Biſhop muſt not be a ſtriker*, is a meer Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, which yet we know is one of St. *Paul*'s Canons, 1 *Tim.* 3. 3. Though at the ſame time we muſt confeſs that the Depoſition, which is the Penalty annex'd is purely Eccleſiaſtical. The matter of ſome Church Canons is often purely Eccleſiaſtical as well as the Penalty; but it will not follow that all are ſo. For as the Prince frequently cauſes old Laws to be obſerved, reinforceing them by Proclamation, ſo have Synods done with Ancient Scripture Laws and Rules. In this Caſe the King makes not new Laws, nor the Synods new Eccleſiaſtical Canons. The Primitive Chriſtians were wont to explain, and propound unto the Church the belief of the great Fundamental and Eſſential Articles of Chriſtianity, as that of the Trinity againſt the *Arrians*, and that of Grace againſt the *Pelagians*, upon pain of Depoſition or Excommunication; We muſt not hence infer that theſe were only Canonical not Scripture Truths, becauſe others of their Definitions were ſo. In ſhort the Tryal of the Subject matter of Church Canons, whether Divine or purely Eccleſiaſtial will depend on the Scripture chiefly. Thither we are to reſort for ſatisfaction, and not fancy whatever has been reinforced by Canon is meerly Canonical. We have 'tis hoped already thence clear'd that point about Epiſcopal Ordination: That which properly belongs to us here, is to prove it to have been the Principle and Practice of the Church in the beginning of the Fourth Century, when the *Alexandrian* and *Nicene* Synods were Aſſembled, which we think alſo is hitherto made good.

See Cod. Ec. Afr. apud Juſt.

But *Blondel* goes on: " *Iſchyras* was depoſed by the *Alexan-* *Apol.* p. 326.
" *drian* Biſhops; whence it appears, he was taken for a Presby-
" ter, not a meer *Laic*: For elſe 'tis abſurd to affirm he was depoſed. A Man
" cannot be ſaid to be knock'd down, except he ſtood on his Feet
" before.

Anſ. This is what we utterly deny, and is indeed a Meer quirk, no better than fooling. *Iſchyras* and many others were not properly depoſed, but only declared no Presbyters, as being Ordained by a Presbyter, which may reaſonably be gathered from the Expreſſions uſed in the foreſaid Synodical Epiſtles, concerning ſuch as *Collutbus* had Ordained, λαϊκοὶ γεγόνασι, ἀναδεχθέντες εἰς τὸν ... τῶν πρεσβυτέρων and *Iſchyras* λαϊκὸς ὤφθη denote no more. And therefore, when the Synod of *Jeruſalem* complained, how the *Euſebians* cauſed *Iſchyras* to be called Biſhop, they aggravated the Inſolence in theſe Words, ἐπισκοπὴν μηδὲ πρεσβύτερος ὅλως ὤν, whereas he was not ſo much as a Presbyter, *viz.* at that very time; that's to ſay, *Ep. Synod. Hier.*

When

When *Colluthus* was alive and in ſome Credit, and when the *Euſebians* gave him out for a Biſhop, before the *Alexandrian* Synod was aſſembled, or had declared him a *Laic*, even then he was not ſo much as a Presbyter. So that he was a meer *Laic* in the Nature of the thing, and before the *Alexandrian* Fathers had ſo pronounced him. Nor do I ſee any impropriety in ſaying *Iſchyras* (tho' no Presbyter) was depoſed. For though he was really no Presbyter as being Ordained by a Presbyter only, yet he took upon him the Office and Title of Presbyter, ſupported and upheld himſelf by Stilts, by Confidence and Hypocriſy: He was believed a Presbyter by many, and by many countenanced and kept up as ſuch. Now though a Man lying proſtrate on the floor can't be Knock'd down, *qui jacet in terrâ non habet unde cadat*; yet he who ſtands on Crutches or is held up by others, 'tis not abſurd to ſay, He may be Knock'd down, which is ſufficient to ſhew the Weakneſs of *Blondel*'s fancy, And the falſe Colours put on this Argument.

But *Blondel* gives it yet a finer Turn thus—" It was uſual in that Age (ſays " he) to reduce real Biſhops and Presbyters, tranſgreſſing the Canons of the " Church, *ad Laicam Communionem*: and yet it cannot be deny'd, but they had " been real Biſhops.

Anſ. This is very true: But is juſt ſuch another piece of Sophiſtry as before, and reaches not the Merits of the Cauſe. For 1. this will not evince that ever *Iſchyras* was a Presbyter, though ſome real Presbyters for Crimes proved upon them were allowed only Lay-Communion. He has not ſhewn us that they were declared meer *Laics*: They were only ſuſpended from performing the Office of Presbyters, and admitted to Lay-Communion, their Character ſtill (as I may ſay) lying dormant in them. If any ſuch Inſtance were to be found, it can't thence be gathered, that *Iſchyras* alſo was ſo dealt with. 'Tis abſurd to argue from one or a few particular Inſtances, unto all others or to any other ſingle Caſe, eſpecially which differs from them. For 'tis one thing to miſdemean ones ſelf in an Office, another to counterfeit it. The former is deprived from performing, what he is otherwiſe rightly qualify'd for, the latter is not what he pretends to be. The inſtance of the former kind is of a pure Eccleſiaſtical Puniſhment, whereas the latter labours under a defect and Error of the firſt Concoction which in the Nature of the thing annuls all his following Miniſterial Acts, he having never received the Power, which he pretends to. Though therefore a Real Presbyter is for his miſbehaviour ſometimes condemn'd to Lay-Communion, yet the ſuſpenſion taken of, as he once was, ſo he again becomes a real Presbyter to all intents and purpoſes. 'Tis no good Conſequence hence drawn that a Counterfeit Presbyter (ſuch was *Iſchyras*) who is declared a meer *Laic*, muſt needs have been a Presbyter: Neither will it follow that he, who has uſurp'd the Seat of a Presbyter, from whence he is thruſt down and depoſed, was ever a real Presbyter. For a Man may well enough be ſaid to be depoſed from an Office which he uſurps and diſcharges for a while, but never had a Right and Title to. A Real King, though depoſed was once a real King; that's undeniable; but one that perſonates and is called a King, and Acts all the parts of the Royal Character for a time, muſt be acknowledged never to have been a real King. 'Twas *Iſchyras* his Caſe, He Acted the part of a Presbyter, and was afterwards Kick'd off the Stage, ſhall it hence be concluded He was once a real Presbyter? Under *Blondel*'s favour I think not. But

Let us ſee now what Mr. *O.* (who has a Knack at improving Arguments) has offered about the Caſe of *Iſchyras.* He acknowledges *Colluthus* was but a pretended Biſhop, and therefore was Commanded by the *Alexandrian* Council to be a Presbyter. I am of this Mind, and 'tis all I demand ſhould be granted me. The Reader of himſelf will diſcern hereby, that he has given up the Whole Cauſe. But perhaps Mr. *O.* means, that *Colluthus* pretending to be a Biſhop, though he was not one, and under that falſe Colour to Ordain, therefore not his Power of Ordaining as a Presbyter was called in Queſtion, but his Diſſimulation in taking upon him to be what he was not, was condemned, and ſo he was publickly declared to be a Presbyter, that is a *pretended* Biſhop only. Plea p. 181.

Anſ. But I aſk then, why was *Iſchyras* laid aſide as a meer *Laic?* Surely, not becauſe his Ordainer falſly aſſumed the Character of Biſhop, which belonged not to him. But then (ſay I) is it not hard my Ordainers Diſſimulation (ſuppoſing him otherwiſe to have the Power) ſhould annul my Orders. But *Colluthus* his Ordinations were vacated, not becauſe he pretended to be a Biſhop and was not, but becauſe he was a Presbyter without Power to Ordain.

Well! But Mr. *O.* tells us, "*Iſchyras's* Ordination was declared void as being "not acknowledged by the Authors, *Colluthus* belike not owning he had Or- "dained *Iſchyras*: So that it not appearing, 'twas taken for granted, He was "never Ordained, and ſo He became a *Laic*, no Presbyter; not becauſe he "was Ordained by a Presbyter, but for want of any Ordination, that appeared. The meaning of all which (as I apprehend) is that the inſtance makes nothing againſt Ordination by Presbyters, ſeeing here was no Ordination at all, *Iſchyras's* Ordainers not owning, that they had impoſed hands on him.

For anſwer hereunto I referr the Reader to what is above replyed unto ſomething of this kind: The ſum whereof is that *Iſchyras* was either really Ordained by *Colluthus* the Presbyter, or at leaſt by his Judges taken for ſuch, which is the ſame thing.

As for Dr. *Field's* Argument (his Authority I meddle not with) cited by Mr. *O.* in theſe Words, *Presbyters Ordinations were accounted void by the Rigor of the Canons in uſe then, becauſe Ordinations* ſine Titulo *were Null, Concil. Chalced. Can.* 6. it belongs not to the time we are now ſpeaking of, the Council of *Chalcedon* being Held an Hundred and twenty Years after that of *Nice*: Nor was the Qualification of a Title required till long after that Council of *Chalcedon*, wherein alſo I meet not with a Syllable of annulling Ordinations for want of a Title. That 6th Can. makes void Clancular Ordinations not given viſibly in the Face of the Church, the Rule, which required the Candidate to be offered unto the ſuffrage of the Clergy, and People in the Churches and Congregation, being neglected, as *Juſtellus* has obſerved from the Word ἀπολελυμένως. The method of Requiring Titles indeed grew up afterwards, which the Canoniſts in the following Ages gathered from this ſixth Canon of *Chalcedon*, as fancying ſome Analogy or Agreement between them in Reaſon as *Calvin* teaches me. However let us take the Argument as 'tis propounded. *Ordinations by Presbyters were accounted void not in themſelves, but by the Rigor of the Canons in uſe then*: How does this appear? Why, *becauſe Ordinations* ſine Titulo *were null by the ſixth Canon of* Chalcedon, which is See his *Lexic. Jurid.*

juſt

juſt as if one ſhould pretend to prove the Lord's-Day not Holy by Divine appointment but by the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, becauſe the other Holy-Days are not. Is it not poſſible the Lord's-Day may be Holy by Divine Inſtitution, though *Good Friday* is not? Or that Ordinations by Presbyters may be Null in themſelves and by Scripture, though Ordinations *ſine Titulo* be uncanonical only? But, if Mr. *O.* intended this only as the Judgment of ſo Learned a Perſon as Dr. *Field*, I let it paſs as ſuch, being no ways obliged to account for the Opinions of private Doctors.

The Reverend Author of *the Naked Truth* (if I rightly apprehend Mr. *O.* for I liſt not to look after the Book its ſelf) intends to prove by the *Nicene* Canon (*which forbids Biſhops to Ordain in one anothers Dioceſſes*) *that the Irregular Ordinations by Biſhops are as Null, as the irregular Ordinations by Presbyters.* Now there is no ſtrength in this Reaſoning. I can ſcarce allow it to be ſenſe. He ought firſt to make out, that Presbyters have power to Ordain, and then indeed the irregular Ordinations of the one would be Null as well as of the other and both alike: But we deny Presbyters to have Power to Ordain (be ſure That *Nicene* Canon gives them none) and therefore the Compariſon here is fooliſh and frivolous. 'Tis as if one ſhould lay down this grave *Maxim—the Irregular Sentence of a Judge is as Null, as that of a private Man*, whereas a private Man can give no decretory Sentence at all. I own Biſhops in their Ordinations were under many Canonical Reſtraints, and ſome of their irregular Ordinations were decreed Null, at leaſt ſo as that the Ordained, were not allowed to exerciſe their Function. But to talk of the Irregularities of Ordinations by Presbyters is to ſuppoſe it proved they have Power to Ordain, which is to beg the Queſtion. I am ſure their power is not intimated in the *Nicene* Canons (as that of Biſhops is) nor in any other that I am yet acquainted with. If a Canon were any where to be found reſtraining Ordinations made by Presbyters, and limiting the manner and circumſtances of 'em, 'twere reaſonable thence to gather that Presbyters had Power to Ordain: But the Canonical Reſtraints laid upon Biſhops will not convince me that Presbyters had that Power. Finally one may by the ſame Reaſoning conclude that Deacons, yea, that every Ordinary believer had power to Ordain, as well as Biſhops. Thus I proceed in the Argument—*By the* Nicene *Canons, Biſhops Ordinations in others Dioceſſes without conſent are forbid, and hence we ſee, the irregular Ordinations of Biſhops are as Null as the irregular Ordinations of Ordinary believers and Deacons*: But this is no better than beating the Air, out of nothing to gather ſomething. For all this while neither Deacons nor Believers have power at all to Ordain. Haply Mr. *O.* has left the Reverend Authors Argument ſhort: So I diſmiſs it.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of Aerius.

THis was a Turbulent and Heretical Preſbyterian the only one to be met with in all Antiquity. It may not be amiſs in few Words to preſent the Reader with his Character, as 'tis tranſmitted to us by St. *Auſtin* and *Epiphanius.* The former tells us, that *being a Presbyter he is reported to have been troubled, becauſe he could not be Ordained a Biſhop; that he fell into the* Arrian *Hereſie, adding to it ſome of his own Conceits, as that ſtated Faſts ought not to be obſerved, and that a Presbyter ought no ways to be diſtinguiſhed from a Biſhop; that the* Aerians *his followers admitted to their Communion only the Continent, or ſuch as embraced a Celibate Life, and who had ſo far renounced the World, as to account nothing their own: And did not abſtain from Fleſh* in the appointed times, *as* Epiphanius *writes.* This *Epiphanius*, among many other Errors, and ſome of the aforeſaid particularly remembers that *he ſought to be a Biſhop but could not obtain it.* He calls it λόγον μανιώδη, *an hairbrained and mad Doctrine, &c.* that of the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters. When *Epiphanius* had reckoned up a great many of his Errors and Hereſies, he proceeds to refute 'em, and in the firſt place takes him to task for that about the Identity of Biſhops and Preſbyters. In ſhort, he ſets him forth as a very Wicked and Impious Fellow.

St. *Auſt. de Hær.* 5. 3.

Ep. Hæreſ. 56. *ſive.* 77.

It is not material in the Diſpute, whether *Aerius* was an Heretick, or is called ſo by *Epiphanius* and St. *Auſtin* on the account of his teaching Biſhops and Preſbyters to be equal. I am ſure St. *Auſtin* places this Error of his in the front and before that of *Arrianiſm*: And both condemn him for his Opinion about Biſhops and Presbyters, which is ſufficient to my Purpoſe, For I am not concerned about private Perſons Opinions, ſuch as Biſhop *Jewel* though an excellent Man, and one of the greateſt Ornaments of our Church and of the Reformation, or others mentioned by Mr. p. * —Whatever their Sentiments were, I ſhall hereafter ſhew, that it was ever the publick Judgment of the Reformed Church of *England*, that Biſhops were *Jure Divino*, and I hope 'tis no breach of Modeſty to confront theirs with the Churches Authority.

* *Page* 114. 123. 124.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Of Hilary *the* Deacon.

IT is not agreed among the Criticks, who was the Author of the *Commentaries* on St. *Paul's* Epiſtles, which are in the Works of St. *Ambroſe*, Vol. 5. and 'tis as uncertain unto whom belong the *Quæſtiones veteris & novi Teſtamenti* in St. *Auſtin*, Tom. 4. There are ſome excellent paſſages found in them, and cited by *Auſtin* in his Tracts againſt the *Pelagians* under the Titles of *Beatus & Sanctus Hilarius*, whence ſome conclude they cannot be aſcribed to ſo ill a Man as the Deacon: But that either *Hilary* Biſhop of *Poictiers*, or *Hilary* of *Arles* muſt have them. Yet *Voſſius* * contends that thoſe Titles of *Beatus & Sanctus*, were by Cuſtom and in Civility given to all Clergy-Men, whether they deſerved them or not, as at this Day, *Reverendus & Venerabilis* are: That the Commentaries were written when *Damaſus* was *Rector Eccleſiæ*, *Pope of Rome*, and that *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, dying in the ſecond Year of *Damaſus*, was too Old, to have either time or ſtrength to perform ſuch a Work, whilſt that Pope was living: And laſtly, that *Hilary* of *Arles*, came too late to write in *Damaſus* his Pontificate, or to be quoted by St. *Auſtin*. And thus the *Commentaries* and *Queſtions* will fall to the Deacon's ſhare.

Auſt. de nat. & grat. cont. Pel. c. 62. Ep. ad Bonif. l. 4. p. 916.
* Hiſt. Pelag. Part. 1. p. 168.

Comment. in 3. Cap. 1. Ep. ad Tim.

Anſ. 1. 'Tis certain to me, *Hilary* of *Poictiers* was not the Author of the *Queſtions* and *Commentaries*, as we now have them. But not for the reaſon aſſigned. Thoſe words *cujus hodie Rector eſt Damaſus* are on 1 *Tim.* 3. from whence to the end of the Commentaries are but 52 leaves in *Folio*, which he might have time and ſtrength to finiſh in that Popes firſt Year. The *Commentaries* moreover break off abruptly at the 10th Ch. of the Hebrews, and the work is left unfiniſhed, whence it may be thought that there his Life or his ſtrength might fail him. But ſtill it is confeſſed *Hilary* of *Poictiers* was not the Author of them; They are too mean to be Fathered upon ſo great a Man. 2. The Particular Teſtimonies ſpoken of before cannot be attributed unto *Hilary* of *Arles*: For he flouriſhed Twenty Years after *Auſtin*. 3. Neither can they belong to the Deacon a Perſon of no credit or Authority, as I ſhall ſhew. Wherefore 4. They were cited out of ſome Work of *Hilary* of *Poictiers* not now extant, which may be confirmed by another Teſtimony in *Auſtin* (not yet obſerved by any that I know of) writing ſtill againſt the *Pelagians*——*Eccleſia Catholica adverſus Hæreticos acerrimum Defenſorem Venerandum quis ignorat* Hilarium *Epiſcopum Gallum*? Which can be underſtood of no other *Hilary* then the Biſhop of *Poictiers*, as is manifeſt from what has been ſaid.

Aug. cont. Jul. Pelag. L. 1. Vol. 5. Tom. 7. p. 490.

5. Neither *Bellarmine* nor *Jerom*, allowed this Deacon ſo much as a place in their Catalogues of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, being it ſeems unworthy that Honour. *Bellarmine* indeed incidentally mentions him in his Obſervations on *Ambroſe's* Works, yet makes no reckoning of him. But *Jerom* falls foul on him calling him in deriſion *Orbis Deucalionem*, and adds—*libellos adverſus nos de Hæreticis rebaptizandis edidit.* It can't then be thought St. *Auſtin* would build upon this Deacons Authority. Thus much I thought fit to ſay concerning the Paſſages of St. *Auſtin* borrowed out of *Hilary*, ſuppoſed by ſome to be the Deacon, and Author of the *Commentaries and Queſtions*, of which I will now ſay ſomething conſidering them in the Lump. *Hier. Dial. Orth. & Lucif. Tom. 1. p. 627.*

1. I do ſuppoſe the ſame Perſon or Perſons (whoſoever they were) wrote theſe *Commentaries and Queſtions*. *Blondel* Himſelf is of this Opinion, and ſo is *Bellarmine* in his Obſervations on *Ambroſe's* Works. 2. I alſo Judge they were written long after *Hilary* of *Poitiers*, yea, after *Jerom* and *Auſtin*, by ſome ignorant, idle and knaviſh Fellow, who mixed truth and falſhood, good and bad together, Collecting ſome Notions out of the Fathers, and adding many of his own ſilly conceits. The Teſtimonies which I have ſpoken of were its likely collected out of *Auſtin*; The Diſcourſe, about the Ambition of the *Roman* Deacons, exalting themſelves above Presbyters was borrowed from *Jerom's* Epiſtle to *Evagrius*. But to make ſhort Work on it, Let us hear *Eraſmus's* Cenſure of the Queſtions. "The Author (ſays he) repeats many the ſame things in ſeveral places, propounds the ſame Queſtions, "and treats of 'em over and over again; is not conſtant in his Opinions: Some "ſcraps out of other Mens Works are often inſerted. He repeats what he had "ſaid before, but in a quite different ſtile. He is very idle in ſtarting Queſtions, which he ought not. There is a perfect confuſion in the Work. Sometimes he writes Commentaries, ſometimes Controverſie: Sometimes he "Preaches, and ſometimes diſputes very Fooliſhly and Meerly Prates. He is "often Scurrilous and Abuſive, and yet has ſaid many things worthy to be read "and known, but gathered out of others. He cites not his Authors, he cheats "the Reader with counterfeit Titles. By the repetitions and the diſorder in "his matter he writes of, by his Tumultuous and Womaniſh Talkativeneſs he "even kills his Reader. The firſt part ſeems to be the Work of ſome Greek "affecting to ſpeak Latin, &c. *Ap. Sect. 2. ch. 22. p. 59.* *Quæſt. 101.*

Eraſmus is more favourable to the *Commentaries*, yet confeſſes the Prefaces are not St. *Ambroſes's*, but ſome buſy and illiterate Fellow tack'd 'em to the Commentaries. I make account then theſe *Commentaries and Queſtions* are of no Credit or Authority in any Controverſy whatever.

2. The compiler of theſe has intermixt ſeveral things favouring Epiſcopacy, and ſo is *Jack* o' both-ſides. 1. He expounds the Angels (ſpoken of 1 *Cor.* 11. 10.) Biſhops grounding himſelf on the Revelations: And gives the Reaſon why *Women ought to be covered in the Church becauſe of the Angels*, that is, Biſhops, *quia Epiſcopus perſonam habet Chriſti & vicarius eſt Domini*, ſuſtains the Perſon of Chriſt and is the Vicar of the Lord. The which muſt be underſtood of the Days of *Paul*: Elſe the Explanation is altogether fruitleſs and impertinent. 2. He reſembles the Deacons to the Levites, Presbyters to the Prieſts, whereof

one was the High-Prieſt unto whom the Biſhop anſwers ſee Queſtion 101. 3. He grants *Timothy* had the Power of Ordaining committed to him by *Paul* in theſe Words, *unde Quemadmodum Epiſcopum ordines* Timotheus, *oſtendit* Paulus. But he no where expreſly allows this to the Presbyters. Many other Obſervations, if it were worth while, might be Collected out of this Author tending to the ſame purpoſe.

3. He contradicts himſelf the Holy Scripture, and the moſt Ancient Writers in the Church. He affirms that at firſt all might Preach, Baptize and explain Scripture, but after, Churches were Eſtabliſh'd and Diſtinct Offices were appointed, and the Church began to be govern'd another way, ſo that no Man ſhould preſume to Officiate in Holy things, except he were Ordained. Whereas nothing is more manifeſt than that there were at the Council of *Jeruſalem* *, beſides, Deacons two Species of Officers at leaſt, Apoſtles and Elders, to ſay nothing of Prophets, of whom alſo we read, *Act.* 15. That when St. *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, there were *ſet in the Church* by God himſelf, Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors, Teachers, &c. The ſame are to be met with in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*. In that to the *Philippians* we read of their Apoſtle, of their Biſhops (or Presbyters,) and their Deacons. *Timothy* and *Titus* had their Elders and Deacons under them. To omit ſundry, other examples hereof in Scripture, *Clemens Romanus* tells us, that the Lord appointed *who* were to Miniſter in Divine Offices among the Chriſtians, and *Ignatius* needs not here to be brought in for Evidence. But let us conſider the ſeveral Inſtances Mr. *O.* gives in Confirmation of this Paradox, that there were no Miniſters in the Church at the beginning.

* *Acts* 15.

The firſt is of *Philip*. But *Philip* had been Ordained by Impoſition of Hands, and beſides was a Perſon endued with extraordinary and ſupernatural Gifts, that is was a Prophet, and of ſuch I readily grant it true, that they were not ſtrictly and indiſpenſably ty'd to common Rules of Order, but might do what the Spirit moved 'em to. But 'tis remarkable what *Hilary* himſelf ſays of *Philip*, *Evangeliſta Diaconi ſunt ſicut Philippus*. So then here were Miniſters thus Early beſides the Apoſtles. As for *Apollos Act.* 18. 24. to paſs by other Obſervations that might be uſeful, I much queſtion whether, when he preach'd at *Epheſus*, he was yet a Chriſtian, or rather am poſitive he was none: For he *knew only the Baptiſm of* John, v. 25. unto whom therefore *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, *expounded the way of God more perfectly*, v. 26. And tho' after this he ſtill Preach'd at *Corinth*, v. 28. it may be ſaid that by this time he had been Ordained to it, for any thing appears to the contrary: And we muſt not think none were Ordained, but ſuch of whom 'tis expreſly teſtify'd in Scripture: We ought rather to conclude all were Ordain'd because many were. Of *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, their inſtructing *Apollos*, I have ſhewed elſewhere, that it was private not Miniſterial Inſtruction. In ſhort, I know not one Example of a Perſon unordained, and of ordinary Gifts only, that took upon him to Preach in any Chriſtian Aſſemblies, much more to adminiſter the Holy Sacraments; nor can I fancy, when that time was of which *Hilary* ſpeaks, when every Man that would, did Adminiſter in the Word and Sacraments.

But

But the ſtory of *Origen* is urg'd, who was made Catechiſt in the School of *Alexandria*, and taught the *Catechumens* in the Rudiments of Chriſtianty, as Dr. *Cave* relates it, and what is yet more, *Theoctiſtus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, and *Alexander* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* invited him to Preach before them.

As *Africa* has always been noted for a Country abounding with ſtrange and Monſtrous Creatures; ſo are we continually peſter'd with ſome ſurprizing and extraordinary fact in the *Egyptian* Church, as if that differed from all the World beſides. But to this Example of *Origen*, I firſt ſay, that Mr. *O.* is as much obliged to reconcile it with the Preſbyterian Principles, as I am with the Epiſcopal: That *Origen*, though he inſtructed the *Catechumens* at *Alexandria* in the principles of Chriſtianity (ſo do our School-Maſters though not Ordained;) Haply once or ſo he preach'd at *Ceſarea* before he had been Ordained, (ſo do our Fellows of Colleges at the Univerſity): Yet this is nothing to the Sacraments, which he did not preſume to Adminiſter; and laſtly though *Theoctiſtus* and *Alexander* of *Jeruſalem*, out of Curioſity deſirous to hear the great *Origen* Diſcourſe upon ſome profound point in Chriſtianity invited him into the Pulpit, yet *Demetrius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* condemn'd it, and it became a Scandal and occaſion of offence among them.

Mr. *O.* ſpeaking of Evangeliſts would prove them to have been unfixt Officers from this obſervation out of *Hilary*, that Evangeliſts, that is Deacons (as *Hilary* thinks) did Preach *ſine Cathedra*, which he expounds without a fixt Reſidence. *Def.* p. 145.

Anſ. This is more abſurd then any thing I have met with in my Adverſary. *Sine Cathedra, without a fixt Reſidence?* He might as well have render'd it *without fear or Wit.* The meaning doubtleſs is, that whereas Presbyters had their Stalls, as well as the Biſhop, and ſate in his Preſence, and perhaps according to *Hilary* Preach'd out of them, the Deacons always ſtood, nor had their Stalls, ſo that when permitted they Preach'd *ſine Cathedra*. *Stantibus Diaconis*, we often meet with in St. *Cyprian*; and *Hilary* himſelf took Notice—*that the Roman Deacons did not aſſume the Privilege of ſitting in the Church*, had no *Cathedra*, no ſeat in it. *Jerom* has alſo obſerv'd the ſame; *Sedent Presbyteri, ſtant Diaconi.* So that *Hilary's* meaning was hereby to diſtinguiſh the one from the other, and intimated that Deacons were inferior to Presbyters, being not ſuffer'd to ſit or to have a Stall in the Church, as the other had. In ſhort, no one ſurely will dare to ſay, that Deacons were unfixt Officers in the Church, either in the Apoſtles or in *Hilary's* Days. *Epiphan. Hær.* 56. *ſeu.* 57. *Quæſt.* 101.

“Mr. *O.* and before him *Blondel*, in Order to prove that Biſhops were meerly the firſt Preſbyters, and had only precedency, but no Power or Juriſdiction over the reſt, argue from *Hilary*, that in the beginning the oldeſt Preſbyter in Years ſucceeded into the Epiſcopacy, and ſo became the *πρόεδρος*, the Preſident of the Preſbytery, and that this Apoſtolical Cuſtom or Practiſe, continued till it was by experience found, that undeſerving or diſabled Old Men were advanced to the prejudice of Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, and the diſhonour of the Church: 'Twas therefore chang'd into Election to the end, not Order, but Merit might take place. *Apol.* 2. 2. c. 21.

Anſ. 1. The Controverſy is not about the manner of ſucceeding into the Epiſcopacy. The Method is either preſcrib'd in Scripture or not. If it be, let the Presbyterians ſhew where, and we promiſe to obſerve it for the future: If not, 'tis left to the Church, to Order this Circumſtance as ſhall be thought fit. In the mean time we may not lay aſide Biſhops, becauſe we have not a Divine Rule about their Succeſſion. Many things are appointed in the Word of God, the particular Circumſtances being left at large unto Humane Prudence. We are commanded to read the Scriptures, but not how much at a time, whether one or more Sections, whether one or more Chapters, nor in what Order: Shall we therefore aboliſh the Command it ſelf, becauſe theſe Circumſtances are not expreſly delivered to us in Scripture? God forbid! Suppoſing then that there have been different Cuſtoms taken up about the way of Succeeding into the Epiſcopacy, this is no prejudice againſt Epiſcopacy its ſelf.

2. It is ſome matter of wonder to me how the Affairs of the Church could be prejudiced by the Oldeſt Presbyters, ſucceeding as of right to the firſt Chair or Preſidency, if he received thereby no Power or Juriſdiction as our Adverſaries pretend.

3. It is falſe, and nothing can be falſer then this conceit of the Oldeſt Presbyter ſucceeding into the Epiſcopacy. *Timothy* was a Young Man and promoted by St. *Paul*, and that not for his Age, but his Merit; For ſurely none can believe he was the Oldeſt among the *Epheſian* Elders. What occaſion then for the Apoſtles Admonition—*let no Man deſpiſe thy Youth*, if all the Presbyters were Younger than himſelf? And *Jerom*, who affirms that *Paul* Ordained *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, his *Maxim* was, *Presbyter ætatis Nomen eſt*, *Epiſcopus Officii*: It had then been more Congruous according to our Adverſaries Argument to have named all of 'em Biſhops, except the Preſident, who ſhould have been called Presbyter as being the Eldeſt among them. Afterwards *Ignatius* exhorts the *Magneſians*, not to deſpiſe *Damas* their Biſhop for his Youth. Laſtly, *Eutychius* aſſures us, that the Presbyters of *Alexandria* by *Mark's* Inſtitution, choſe their Patriarch, ſo that Merit and Election not Age determined the Competition. By the way they alſo according to this Author *Eutychius* Ordained their Patriarch by Prayer and Impoſition of Hands: With what Truth then could *Hilary* aſſert. *Epiſcopi & Presbyteri una eſt Ordinatio*?

But I have done this Fictitious *Hilary* his Queſtions and Commentaries, too great an Honour in waſting thus much Paper about Him and Them.

CHAP. XII.

Of St. Jerom's *Teſtimony.*

Before I examine the Teſtimonies of this Father alledg'd by Mr. *O.* in favour of the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters, I will lay down my own Hypotheſis, ſuch, I am perſwaded, as is agreeable to the Word of God. And

And I am of Opinion alſo will go a great way to reconcile *Jerom* with himſelf.

As for my own Opinion I make account with Bp. *Pearſon*, that the Chriſtian Church ſtrictly ſpeaking, began upon the Day of *Pentecoſt*, when the Spirit deſcended upon the Holy Apoſtles, and, as I may ſay, anointed them unto the Office of Preaching the Goſpel, and eſtabliſhing the Chriſtian Church throughout the World beginning at *Jeruſalem*. That they were for ſome ſmall time the only Eccleſiaſtical Officers in the Church: That when the Church increaſed and believers were multiply'd, and by conſequence the Apoſtles unable to manage the Whole Work by themſelves, they took in ſeaven Deacons to their Aſſiſtance, devolving on them intirely one branch of their Power, *viz.* diſpenſing the Publick Alms among the Poor, as alſo admitting them to Preach the Word and Baptize, when Occaſion offered, or neceſſity required, or their Leiſure from their own proper buſineſs would allow: That not very long after (the Church ſtill encreaſing more and more, and believers multiplying not only at *Jeruſalem* but at *Samaria*, and in other parts of *Judea*) the Apoſtles added another ſort of Church Officers, that is Preſbyters, *Acts.* 11. 30. *ch.* 15. That to theſe Preſbyters were committed by the Apoſtles, the Principal Care and Truſt of Miniſtring in the Word and Sacraments, and in their Abſence of Ruling the Flock in Matters of leſs Moment, the Apoſtles ſtill reſerving to themſelves the Supreme Power, in the Higheſt and Important affairs of the Church, which they diſcharged either by Meſſengers or by Letters, or elſe viſiting them, and laſtly that theſe Preſbyters were indifferently called, either Elders or Biſhops, and governed the aforeſaid Churches in a Parity among themſelves. Of this Interval of time, I reckon *Jerom* might ſpeak, when he contends for the Parity and Identity of Biſhops and Preſbyters. The Churches then hitherto were governed *Communi Preſbyterorum Conſilio*, by the Colleges of Preſbyters, no other preſiding over them in the Apoſtles Abſence. In proceſs of time, when the Apoſtles had determined among themſelves to diſperſe, in Order to the Preaching of the Goſpel unto all the World, they reſolv'd, that one being choſen from among the Preſbyters ſhould be ſet over the reſt, unto whom all the care of the Church ſhould belong, the ſeeds of Schiſm might be taken away, and that this ſhould be eſtabliſhed and obſerved, *toto Orbe* throughout the World. The period of time, when this Courſe was Taken by the Apoſtles, I have ſpoken of in the Preface. But *Jerom* in this Circumſtance ſeems not at one with himſelf. For whereas in his Commentaries on the Epiſtle to *Titus*, he ſuppoſes the Apoſtles to have taken up this Reſolution after the *Corinthian* Schiſm, yet making *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, He muſt of Neceſſity ſuppoſe it done before or at the Council of *Jeruſalem*, at which time there was not any Church, or ſo much as one Chriſtian at *Corinth*. By what name or Title the Perſons thus choſen out of the Preſbyters, and intruſted with the Supreme Government of Churches were called, is of little Moment to be enquired into. Nevertheleſs if *Theodoret* is to be Credited (as I know no reaſon to the contrary) they alſo were at firſt ſtiled Apoſtles, and it is with reaſon thought that *Epaphroditus* is therefore reckon'd or rather declared the *Apoſtle* of the *Philippians* *. *Blondel* himſelf acknowledges there were a Secondary ſort of Apoſtles among the Churches, Perſons of the Higheſt Rank and moſt Eminent Gifts, I take theſe things in ſome meaſure proved ſufficiently before,

Lectiones in Act. Apoſt.

De Scr. Ec.

* *Phil.* 2. 25.

before, and in what follows, and moſt reaſonable in themſelves to be ſuppoſed. Nevertheleſs if the Adverſaries ſhall reject them, as 'tis moſt likely they will, I ſhall only ſay that I am not much concerned about them, that is, whether it be poſſible to make *Jerom* write conſiſtently with himſelf. If not, his Teſtimony in the Controverſy before us, is not worth a Ruſh, he having contradicted himſelf, and overthrown in one place, what he is made to have affirmed in another. The Queſtion then upon *Jerom's* Authority is not about the preciſe time, when this Remedy againſt Schiſm was applyed by the Apoſtles; that's to ſay, whether before or immediately after the *Corinthian* Diviſions (let *Jerom* look to that): But more generally, whether he believed or ever aſſerted, or could conſiſtently with himſelf aſſert, that this Proviſion againſt Schiſm was deviſed and made not till after the Apoſtles deceaſe. The Presbyterians are oblig'd to hold the Affirmative, or elſe give up the Cauſe. My buſineſs then is to prove that *Jerom* did not believe nor ever aſſerted, nor could intend to aſſert, that the Decree about chuſing one from among the Presbyters, and ſetting him above the reſt, to preſide and Govern the affairs of the Church was made after the Apoſtles days, by ſome Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution; but that it was the Ordination and Appointment of the Apoſtles themſelves: This I pretend to make appear by the following Obſervations out of *Jerom*.

1. Theſe Words of *Jerom*, *toto Orbe decretum eſt*, muſt denote it to have been an Apoſtolick Conſtitution. For an Eccleſiaſtical Decree obliging all Chriſtendom to its Obſervation could never have been made for above 200 Years after the Apoſtles deceaſe; and nothing leſs then an Oecumenical Synod had competent Power to preſcribe this Remedy againſt Schiſm. But there never was any ſuch Univerſal Council before that of *Nice* (too late to Father the Decree in the Judgment even of our Adverſaries themſelves.) Moreover this Apoſtles Canons (as they are commonly called) which are a Collection of the moſt Ancient Decrees of the Church, take it for granted, that the Government of the Church was lodg'd in the Hands of Biſhops, and only regulate ſome Circumſtances about their Ordinations and the Methods of their Government. If Biſhops had been meerly by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, we ſhould certainly have found them eſtabliſhed in theſe Apoſtolical Canons. It is not to be imagin'd the Collectors of them would have omitted ſo important a Decree as this, whereon ſo many of their other Canons are built as on a Foundation. *Jerom's toto Orbe decretum eſt*, muſt then imply that Epiſcopacy was an Apoſtolical Conſtitution.

Can. Apoſ. 1. 2. and others.

2. The ſame may be argued from thoſe Words, *Remedium Schiſmatis* & *Epiſcopus nominabant*, in *Jerom's* Epiſtle to *Evagrius*. The Remedy then againſt Schiſm, muſt be as Ancient as the *Preſidents*, who according to *Jerom* were called *Biſhops*. Now they were ſtil'd Biſhops before *Ignatius* was Martyred, as abundantly appears in his Epiſtles; therefore this Remedy againſt Schiſm was deviſed in the Apoſtolick Age, except any one will affirm that *Ignatius*, and all the other Followers, Diſciples, Fellow-Labourers, and Fellow-Soldiers of the Apoſtles, who gave Teſtimony to the Goſpel of Chriſt even unto Bloud, prepared this new Remedy againſt Schiſm, ſo ſoon as the Apoſtle St. *John's* Eyes were Shut; and took upon them to ſet up a Government in the Church, which the Apoſtles were altogether ſtrangers to, as our Adverſaries ſuppoſe.

3. *Jerom*

3. *Jerom.* Witnesseth over and over again, that Biſhops were eſtabliſhed in the Churches, whilſt the Apoſtles lived and flouriſhed. Upon thoſe Words—*Quae eſt in te per impoſitionem manuum mearum*, he thus gloſſes *ſcilicet ad Epiſcopatum.* Upon thoſe other Words—*cum Epiſcopis & Diaconis*, he thus comments—*hic Epiſcopos Presbyteros intelligimus, non enim in una Urbe plures Epiſcopi eſſe potuiſſent*, intimating that though Biſhops and Presbyters were the ſame in that place, yet there was then an Higher Degree of Biſhops, of whom there could be but one in a City. Now *Jerom* here muſt of neceſſity ſpeak of the Apoſtles days, elſe his Comment had been altogether vain and abſurd. For to expound St. *Paul's* Words by an uſage, which ſprang up in the Church long after, were ſenſleſs. Beſides, he thinks *Epaphroditus* was at that time Biſhop of *Philippi*, as is plainly implyed when he gloſſes on the other paſſage in this Epiſtle—Epaphroditum *Commilitonem meum—Commilito propter laborem: Quia & ipſe acceperat in illis Apoſtolatus Officium. Epaphroditus* then was the Apoſtle of the *Philippians* according to *Jerom*, that is in the Eccleſiaſtical Language he was their Biſhop. Again whereas *Jerom* queſtions *Archippus* to have been a Deacon of the Church of *Coloſſ.* ch. 4. 17. yet elſewhere, he puts the queſtion to Himſelf—*Quid eſt miniſterium quod* Archippus *accepit a Domino?* And Anſwers—*Legimus, &* Archippo *Commilitoni noſtro, excepto quia aut Epiſcopum eum fuiſſe Coloſſenſis Eccleſiae, aut ſi hic non eſt*, &c. hereby though not poſitively aſſerting him the Biſhop of *Coloſs*, yet implying plainly by the Disjunctive there were Biſhops in thoſe days. Moreover *Jerom* in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers reckons up, *James* made Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* by the Apoſtles, and *Simeon* after him, *Timothy* of *Epheſus*, *Titus* of *Crete* by *Paul*, and *Polycarp* of *Smyrna* by *John*. On the 45 *Pſalm.* he thus ſpeaks—*Conſtituit Chriſtus in omnibus finibus Mundi Principes Eccleſiae* i. e. *Epiſcopos*; And that by Princes he here meant ſingle Supreme Governours of Churches, appears from his Comment on the 1ſt of *Titus*, where he has this Obſervation, that Paul *was then forming a Prince of the Church of* Crete. This Inſtitution then being by *Jerom* attributed unto Chriſt himſelf, muſt be underſtood as done at leaſt by the Apoſtles of Chriſt. Laſtly, *Jerom* Notes †, that all who ſaw the Lord, and Preached the Goſpel were called Apoſtles, *paulatim vero tempore procedente*, others alſo were Ordained Apoſtles by them, whom the Lord had choſen, as *Epaphroditus.* We can underſtand no leſs by Ordained Apoſtles here, than thoſe who were ſet over Churches to Rule them called afterwards Biſhops: And the *paulatim* here being to be underſtood of the Apoſtles time, will let us in to the underſtanding *Jerom's paulatim* and his *poſtquam*, in his Commentaries on *Titus*, and that the Decree there ſpoken of was put in Execution by the Apoſtles themſelves but by Degrees.

Jer. com. in 2d. Ep. ad Tim. c. 1. v. 6. Tom. 4.

Id. in Philip. c. 1. v. 1. Tom. 3.

Id. Com. ad Phil. 2. Tom. 3.

† Com. in 1. Cap. Ep. ad Galatas.

If then *Epaphroditus* was Biſhop of *Philippi*, *Archippus* of *Coloſs*, *James* of *Jeruſalem*, *Timothy* of *Epheſus*, and *Titus* Biſhop and Prince of *Crete*, *Polycarp* of *Smyrna*, and in a Word, if there were Biſhops and Princes appointed by Chriſt in all Quarters of the World, and all whilſt *Paul* was alive in the Opinion of *Jerom*, then *Jerom's in toto orbe decretum eſt*, is to be underſtood of an Apoſtolical Conſtitution.

4. The

4. The occaſion of ſetting up one above the reſt to take the care and charge of the Churches, of neceſſity implies that the Apoſtles themſelves inſtituted Epiſcopacy. It was according to *Jerom* the *Corinthian* Schiſm; And yet more particularly (becauſe our Adverſaries contend that *Jerom* only alluded to the *Corinthian* Schiſm, not that that Schiſm in particular was the occaſion of the Decree: Which is but meer ſhuffling at beſt;) I farther note the Schiſm, which gave occaſion to the Decree, was according to *Jerom* founded on ſuch a Principle and pretence, as is not to be met with in any other Church than that of *Corinth*, nor in any other Age than that of the Apoſtles. The pretence (as *Jerom* believ'd) was —*poſtquam unuſquiſq; eos quos baptizaverat ſuos eſſe putabat non Chriſti, &c.* alluding to the 1 *Cor.* 1. 13, 14, 15. If then the *toto Orbe decretum* was occaſioned by the *Corinthian* Schiſm; which in *Jerom's* Judgment ſprang from that falſe and fooliſh Principle, that every Miniſter might challenge to himſelf all thoſe Chriſtians, whom he had Baptized, to be Members of his own ſeparate Congregation, the Remedy againſt this diſeaſe muſt of neceſſity be confeſs'd to have commenced ſoon after this *Corinthian* Schiſm, and by conſequence in the Apoſtles days.

* Ep. Evag.

5. *Jerom's* inſtancing in the Church of *Alexandria* confirms, what I am proving, *viz.* that Biſhops were appointed in the Apoſtles Days. * *A Marco Evangeliſta uſque ad Heraclam Presbyteri unum ex ſe electum & excelſiori gradu collocatum, Epiſcopum nominabant.* Here we have a Biſhop of *Alexandria* name and thing acknowledg'd by *Jerom*, from *Mark* the Evangeliſt. Therefore *Jerom* muſt have believed the *toto Orbe decretum eſt*, happened in the Apoſtles days, ſince many of them ſurvived St. *Mark*.

6. The Character and Commendation *Jerom* gives of this Inſtitution of Biſhops, I obſerved before, what he has written on the 44 *Pſal. conſtitues Chriſtianis omnibus mundi futuros Principes Eccleſiæ.* If then it was an Inſtitution of Chriſt, it muſt needs be at leaſt Apoſtolical. So he calls it; *Ut ſciamus Traditiones Apoſtolicas ſumptas de veteri Teſtamento.* The Apoſtolical Traditions (or Inſtitutions) were borrowed from the Old Teſtament. And that Epiſcopacy and the three Diſtinct Orders of Church Officers, Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons are included, yea, principally meant here, by the Apoſtolical Traditions is evident from what follows—*Quod* Aaron *& filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt hoc ſibi Epiſcopi Presbyteri & Diaconi vindicent in Eccleſia Chriſtiana. Quod* Aaron *& filios ejus hoc Epiſcopum & Presbyterum noverimus.*

Ep. 2ad Nepot.

7. *Jerom* not obſcurely and more than once inſinuates that Biſhops ſucceeded the Apoſtles. *Apoſtolorum locum tenent Epiſcopi* *. Biſhops hold the place of the Apoſtles. *Habes pro Apoſtolis Epiſcopos filios Apoſtolorum*, you have inſtead of the Apoſtles, Biſhops the Sons of the Apoſtles. *Epiſcopi & Presbyteri habeant in Exemplum Apoſtolos & Apoſtolicos viros, quorum honorem poſſidentes habere nitantur & meritum.* Let Biſhops and Presbyters take for their Pattern, the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical Men, whoſe honour they poſſeſs, and therefore ſhould endeavour to have their Merit. *Non eſt facile ſtare loco Pauli, tenere gradum* Petri †. 'Tis no eaſy matter to ſtand in the place of *Paul* to poſſeſs the degree of *Peter*. *Omnes (ſc. Epiſcopi) ſive Romæ, ſive Eugubii, ſive* Conſtantinopoli Rhegii, *ſive* Alexandriæ, *ſive* Tanais (I may add from

* Jer. Ep. 54 ad Marcel.

Id. in Pſal. 45.

Id. Ep. 13 ad Paulin.

† Id. Ep. 1 ad Heliodor.

from *Jerom ſive Divitis, ſive Pauperis, ſive Sublimis, ſive Inferioris*) *Apoſtolorum ſunt Succeſſores.* * All Biſhops whatever, are the Apoſtles Succeſſors. And whereas in this very Epiſtle, He is exalting his fellow Presbyters as high as with any colour of Pretence he was able, yet no ſuch thing as this drops from him, *ſc.* that the Presbyters are the Apoſtles Succeſſors. — If then Biſhops are the Apoſtles Succeſſors, as if *Jerom* may be Judge, they were, then alſo the Office of a Biſhop muſt needs be by Apoſtolical Inſtitution: For none could appoint Succeſſors unto the Apoſtles but the Apoſtles themſelves.

* *Id. Ep.* 85. *Evag.*

6. The early eſtabliſhment of Biſhops in the very days of the Apoſtles, or at leaſt, immediately after them, will force any Ingenious Man to confeſs Epiſcopacy was of Apoſtolical Inſtitution. This alſo *Jerom* has witneſſed, * telling us that *Clement*, (of whom we read, *Phil.* 4.) was the 4th (ſome ſaid the 2d) Biſhop of *Rome* after *Peter*: That *Ignatius* † was the 3d Biſhop of *Antioch* after *Peter*: That *Papias*, (a Diſciple of St. John the Apoſtle, was Biſhop of *Hierapolis*, and *Quadratus*, a Diſciple of the Apoſtles, Biſhop of *Athens*. To theſe add the *Aſiatick* Biſhops, of whom we read in *Ignatius's* Epiſtles. For becauſe *Jerom* believed the Epiſtles genuine, and approves of the ſubject Matter of them, he has hereby given in his Teſtimony, that there were Biſhops in all thoſe Churches. Is it then poſſible to imagine *Jerom* believed that Decree to be any other than Apoſtolical, or that Epiſcopacy received its Date from a meer Eccleſiaſtical Canon ſometime after? It can never enter into my Head that the Church Government (which ſome ſay was Presbyterian, that is, Adminiſtred by a College of Presbyters acting in a Parity, when the Apoſtles were living) ſhould be thus quickly altered by a meer Humane, or Eccleſiaſtical Decree, upon a pretence of preventing Schiſms; whereas the Apoſtles themſelves did not (as the Presbyterians believe) think this Reaſon ſufficient to change the Church-Government in their time; that is, 'tis moſt improbable and abſurd to ſay ſo many Holy Men and Martyrs of Chriſt, familiar with, and Diſciples of the Apoſtles, *ſc.* St. *Clement*, *Ignatius*, *Papias*, *Quadratus*, and an innumerable Company, (whoſe Names and whoſe particular Dioceſſes are not Tranſmitted unto us, ſays *Euſebius*) ſhould dare not only to decree, and conſent to the Alteration of Church-Government, but themſelves to uſurp and Exerciſe an Authority over their Equals contrary to the Apoſtolical Rule and Practice. From the whole then that has been ſaid, I may reaſonably conclude.

* *Cat. S. E. Clem.*

† *Id. Ignat. in C. S. E.*

Id. Pap.

1. That Epiſcopacy, which is by *Jerom* called *The Remedy againſt Schiſm*, was Set up and Decreed by the Apoſtles in their own days. 2. That though he terms it an Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom and Conſtitution, he is to be taken to mean in oppoſition to *Dominicæ Veritati*, our Lord's own Perſonal Appointment, and not unto Apoſtolical Tradition, or Inſtitution. 3. That what I have offer'd in this Chapter towards the reconciling *Jerom* with himſelf, is moſt reaſonable to be admitted. And laſtly, That the Power and Authority allowed by *Jerom* unto Biſhops, particularly that of Ordination, and the other of Confirmation, belong'd to them by virtue of the Apoſtles Commiſſion, and were not Reſtraints laid upon the Presbyters by Eccleſiaſtical Canons. That of Confirmation he deduces from Scripture in his Dialogue againſt the *Luciferians*.

But Mr. *O.* will, perhaps ſay, that all this is nothing to him; and to the Objections he has laid in our way. I am then obliged now to conſider in particular what Obſervations he has muſtred up out of *Jerom*, and levelled againſt Epiſcopacy in favour of the Presbyterians Claim.

P. 126. "Mr. *O.* then Pleads, that *Jerom* has ſhew'd the Presbyters of "*Alexandria* made their Biſhops for almoſt 200 Years, and that he "would leave nothing out that was Material in Conſtituting them.

Anſ. *Jerom* has not ſhew'd, nor ſo much as directly aſſerted that the Presbyters of *Alexandria* made their Biſhops: But he has omitted ſeveral Circumſtances not only Material, but Advantagious to his main Deſign, if they had been true. *Jerom*, both in his Commentaries on *Titus*, and in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, ſpeaks conſtantly in the Paſſive Voice, how that one was choſen, and ſet over the reſt; but by whom he ſays not. Why not by the Neighbouring Biſhops? Why not by the Predeceſſor as well as by the Presbyters? *Jerom* has not expreſly told us that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* choſen out of the Presbyters, received another, and a new Conſecration, nor that the Presbyters Ordained him, all which would have tended much to the Honour of himſelf, and his Fellow-Presbyters. True, he expreſly ſays, the Presbyters nam'd him Biſhop at his Inſtalment, but this does not neceſſarily imply either that they Choſe, or Ordained him. He ought, and doubtleſs would have ſpoken out, if either, or both theſe things had been true. Whereas then Mr. *O.* adds,

Page 127. *Jerom* mentions no other way of Conſtituting them but by Presbyters, it is certain he mentions no way at all. This is manifeſt beyond all exception. *Jerom* has aſſur'd us of it, that the Apoſtles, not the Presbyters, Made and Ordain'd Biſhops in moſt parts of the Chriſtian World; at *Epheſus*, at *Coloſs*, at *Philippi*, at *Athens*, in *Crete*, at *Jeruſalem*, and if *Mark* did not ſo at *Alexandria*, it were very ſtrange. However *Orbis Major eſt Urbe*. It ſhould indeed ſeem by the Alluſions wherewith *Jerom* explains himſelf, that the Presbyters choſe one of their own Number, and ſet him over the reſt. So (ſays he) the Army chooſes their General, the Deacons their Arch-Deacons. Admitting then this at preſent, I reply. 1. 'Tis no where ſo much as hinted in *Jerom*, that the *Alexandrian* Presbyters Ordain'd their Patriarchs: But rather the contrary, that the neighbouring Biſhops impos'd Hands on him. *Quid facit excepta Ordinatione Epiſcopus quod non faciat Presbyter?* In which words he muſt have an Eye unto the Cuſtom of the *Alexandrian* Church, from *Mark* to *Heraclas*, and *Dionyſius*, implying that Biſhops, not Presbyters Ordain'd all that while.

Well! But I have admitted that the Presbyters of *Alexandria* choſe their Patriarch, and then Mr. *O.* argues * *That* Jerom *makes this an Argument of the Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters.*

* *Plea ibid.*

Anſ. Whatever may be inferred from *Jerom*, I am very ſure this is no good Argument for the Identity and Equality of Biſhops and Presbyters. For it is plain that Ordinary Deacons were not the ſame, nor equal to Arch-deacons, nor the Army to the Emperor, (as I have occaſionally obſerv'd elſewhere) although the Deacons choſe their Arch-deacons, and the Army ſet up the Emperor.

For to what purpoſe is an Arch-Deacon choſen, or a General, if they be but ſtill equal to the Army, and to the Deacons, if they have no power over them?

There

There is a memorable Story to our purpoſe, of the Emperor *Valentinian.* He had been choſen Emperor by the Army. The Soldiers afterwards demanded of him to chuſe and receive a Partner in the Government; to which he reply'd —— "It was in your choice "(fellow Soldiers) whether you would chuſe me Emperor or not; but ſince you "have choſen me, what you require is in my power, not yours, and ye ought "to reſt contented as good Subjects. But to return unto *Jerom.* I have ſhew'd before out of him, that the Apoſtles made Biſhops; what then is become of this Argument for Parity in all the Churches of the World, except *Alexandria?* But if *Jerom* contradicts himſelf paſt all relief, I cannot help it. Yet again. Why may not one imagine that *Jerom's* principal aim being to maintain the Honour of Preſbyters above Deacons, he noted that at *Alexandria,* the Biſhop was choſen not out of the Deacons, but *unum ex ſe, viz.* out of the Preſbyters? Ay, but 'twill be reply'd, that *Jerom* in this Epiſtle deſign'd to prove that Biſhops and Preſbyters, were at firſt the ſame, and that to other Arguments for their Identity, he ſubjoyns this Story of the Church of *Alexandria.* I reply, not ſo, if Mr. *O.* will allow me to reconcile *Jerom* with himſelf. I am not indeed able to account for *Jerom,* when he proves the Identity of Biſhops and Preſbyters, from ſundry places of Scripture, the Epiſtles of *Peter* and *Paul,* and St. *John*; and yet gives us a Catalogue of ſeveral Biſhops in that time. But this I ſay, *Jerom* after he had advanc'd the Honour of Preſbyters above Deacons, in that Epiſtle to *Evagrius,* telling us there was a time when Biſhops and Preſbyters were the ſame. He proceeds to argue from the Church of *Alexandria,* that there, even to *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius,* for 200 Years, the Biſhops were choſen out of the Preſbyters, not out of the Deacons, which Obſervation was not deſigned to prove the Presbyterian Identity, nor the Parity, but the Honour given to the Preſbyters above Deacons, becauſe the Patriarch was for a long while choſen out of their Number only. *Laſtly,* Let what will become of *Jerom* and his Arguments, this is ſure, and confeſſed on all Hands, there were always Biſhops of *Alexandria* from the beginning of their Converſion by *Mark.* It no manner of way belongs to the preſent Controverſy how, or by whom choſen and ſet up. If the Scripture ſhall be thought not to have determin'd this point, I mean what way, and by whom the Biſhops ſhall be Conſtituted, it is then in the Church to determine, but not utterly to lay them aſide.

Soz l. 6. c. 6.

But Mr. *O.* goes on † *We read not of any other Conſecration* of the Biſhops of *Alexandria, than the Presbyters Election, and their placing him in an higher Degree, and naming him Biſhop.* No, has Mr. *O.* forgot, or did he not know till after he had thus ſhot his Bolt, that according to *Eutychius,* cited this very 128th *p,* that by the Inſtitution of *Mark, The Presbyters when the Patriarchſhip was vacant, choſe one of their Number, on whoſe Head they laid their Hands, and bleſſed him, and created him Patriarch.* And if this be true, *Jerom* forgot a very material thing, that would have made for the Honour of Preſbyters and their Identity with Biſhops; and Mr. *O.* forgot another, that of the Presbyters impoſing Hands on their new Patriarch, which I take to be ſomewhat more than Electing, Placing and Naming him Biſhop. Mr. *O.* proves "* there was anciently no other Conſecration but Electing, "Placing and Naming him Biſhop, from the Teſtimony of *Polydor Virgil,* who in his Book *de Invent. rerum, l.* 4. *c.* 6. confeſſeth, (ſays Mr. "*O*)

† *P.* 128.

* *Plea ibid.*

"*O.*) that anciently in making Biſhops there were no Ceremonies uſed, &c.

Anſ. Mr. *O.* has a Knack above all other Men to miſrepreſent Authors: And though I reſolved not to concern my ſelf with late Writers: Yet being *Polydor* was in his time a Learned Man, and of no ſmall Reputation in the *Roman* Church of *Engl.* I will with Mr. *O.* pay ſome deference to his Teſtimony and Character. Let us then hear, what *Polydor* has delivered in the place cited. He tells, "That "*Jeſus Chriſt* created twelve Pontiffs, whom he called Apoſtles, alſo Seventy "Diſciples, whom he made (*Sacerdotes*) Prieſts; that from theſe latter the "Order of Presbyters aroſe, that the Apoſtles and Diſciples were not admitted "into their Office by any other Rites ſave only the Election or Inſtitution of "Chriſt. Which *Polydor* proves immediately after from the practice of the Apoſtles in taking *Matthias* into their Number, and inſtituting the Seven Deacons. Let us run through *Polydor*'s Argument backward, and ſee what it ſays. The Apoſtles impoſed Hands on the Seven Deacons, therefore on *Matthias*, and by conſequence according to *Virgil*, ſo did Chriſt lay Hands on the Apoſtles, and Seventy Diſciples. So that this Authority out of *Polydor* recoils upon himſelf. Indeed Mr. *O.* owns as much: But then thereby he deſtroys his own propoſition, which is, *We know no other Ceremony but Election*, &c. But is not Impoſition of Hands a Ceremony, and more than Electing, placing and nominating him Biſhop? I am perſwaded it is a Ceremony. Thus Mr. *O.* confutes himſelf, when he pretends to confirm his Opinion.

I cannot paſs by one thing, which *Polydor* very falſly tacks to his Diſcourſe here concerning the Original of Impoſition of Hands, which he derives from our Lord and his Apoſtles, but adds, *viz*; *hinc olim factum*, &c. *hence it came about that anciently*, (it was an Old Eccleſiaſtical Practice) *in Conſecrating a Biſhop, the Presbyters impoſed Hands*, and for this cites *Cyprian*'s fourth Epiſtle to *Felix* (in the *Oxford Ed.* the 67. 'Tis pity Mr. *O.* ſtumbled not upon this Hint of *Virgil*. In appearance 'tis better then any He has produced in his *Plea*. But the comfort is there is nothing like this to be found in that Epiſtle; and this I thought proper to Note to the End, no new trouble ſhould be created me upon *Virgil*'s Authority.

Edit. Novi. Bas. 1671. p. 336.

Mr. *O.* "*Jerom* ſaith the Cuſtom was changed, from the time of *Eeraclas* "and *Dionyſius*. What Cuſtom? Not the Election of a Biſhop by Presbyters and "People: For that continued long after; therefore it muſt be *be the Conſtitution* "*of Biſhops* (which afterwards was done) *by Neighbouring Biſhops in the way of* "*Conſecration, that is laying on of Hands*, as I apprehend Mr. *O.*

Hence we muſt learn, that before *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*, the Biſhops were not conſecrated by Impoſition of Hands, but barely elected, &c. that after *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius* the Cuſtom was altered, and then they were Conſecrated by Neighbouring Biſhops with Impoſition of Hands.

Anſ. Jerom teaches us no ſuch thing. He is here only falling upon a new Argument, as I ſaid before, to advance the Honour of Presbyters above Deacons, *ſc.* that at *Alexandria*, the Biſhops were always choſen (*ex ſe*) *out of the Presbyters, ſays* Eutychius, not out of the Deacons (though the Cuſtom was afterwards changed about the time of *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*, or not until *Alexander* as *Eutychius*). Nevertheleſs were Biſhops from the beginning Conſecrated by laying on of Hands, for any thing *Jerom* intimates, and which *Eutychius* has affirmed, as may

also

alſo be reaſonably preſumed and gathered from the practice of the Apoſtles recorded in the Epiſtles to *Timothy*, yea, and from *Jerom* himſelf in the following Period, *excepta Ordinatione*, *Eutychius* his Words are, the Eleven Preſbyters *laid their Hands on the Biſhop (Elect) and Bleſſed and Created him Patriarch.* This Rule was made by *Mark* himſelf.

Mr. *O.* after a long Quotation out of *Eutychius* thus Triumphs, "Here is a full proof of Preſbyters chuſing and creating their Biſhop, and that by Impoſition of Hands, and Benediction or "Prayer. *P.* 129.

Anſ. 1. And here is a full proof that Biſhops were from the beginning, and were Created alſo by Impoſition of Hands, which Mr. *O.* juſt before denyed upon the Authority of *Jerom*, and was now to have proved, if he had ſtuck cloſe to his Argument. But it muſt be confeſs'd, *Eutychius* does aſſert the *Alexandrian* Preſbyters choſe, and created their own Biſhops by Impoſition of Hands and Benediction. Wherefore 2. not to inſiſt any more on the incompetency of *Eutychius* his Authority, a late obſcure and falſe Hiſtorian, I aſk how Mr. *O.* will be able to reconſile *Jerom* with *Eutychius*, the former affirming (as Mr. *O.* underſtands him) that the Preſbyters choſe, and ſet up their Biſhops unto *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius* (then it ſeems this Cuſtom ceas'd) the latter unto *Alexander*: That is to ſay, *Eutychius* will have this Cuſtom to have continued 90 Years longer then *Jerom* aſſigned it. *Eutychius* ſays, the Preſbyters all that while Ordained their Patriarchs by impoſition of Hands; *Jerom* no ſuch matter, but rather the Contrary: They only (as Mr. *O.* will have it) choſe placed and named him Biſhop. We muſt then diſmiſs them both as the Evangeliſt did the Witneſſes againſt our Lord, their Witneſs does not agree together. I only add, that the 6th Canon of the *Nicene* Council ſeems to overturn at leaſt *Eutychius* his Teſtimony: *Let the Ancient Cuſtoms continue*, which I underſtand of all things eſtabliſhed by this Synod, and among the reſt that of the Neighbouring Biſhops in *Egypt*, Ordaining the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*. For if this Synod (as *Eutychius* believed) at the motion of *Alexander* the Patriarch had altered the Old Cuſtom, with what Face could they have laid down this Rule, *Let the Ancient Cuſtoms continue?* Or was it Wiſdom to exaſperate the *Alexandrians* with a New decree, when they were already engaged in Schiſms and Contentions about the *Melitian* Ordinations? To ſhut up this Chapter, whatever *Jerom* ſhall be made to ſay concerning the *Alexandrian* Preſbyters, chuſing placing and nominating their Biſhop, he no where affirms they Ordained him by Impoſition of Hands and Prayer: He acquaints us that the Apoſtles Ordained Biſhops in their Time, not the College of Preſbyters. If afterwards the Preſbyters of *Alexandria* choſe, and created their Biſhop by Impoſition of Hands, it was at beſt but an Eccleſiaſtical Indulgence, for which there is no Rule or Precedent to be found in Scripture or in the Apoſtles Days. But I am well ſatisfy'd, that in truth there could be no ſuch Liberty allowed them. This Principle of St. *Cyprians* (who flouriſhed about 250) ſhews alſo, that in the Days of *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*, that is *Anno* 222 the Biſhops had not yet taken upon them to diſpenſe with any Divine Precept, and therefore could not have given or decreed unto Biſhops, the ſole Inherent Power of Ordination, or reſtrain'd the Preſbyters, if they had any Title to it from the Apoſtles.

Neq; enim aliquid cuiquam largiri poteſt Humana Indulgentia, ubi intercedit & Legem tribuit divina præſcriptio. Cyp. Ep. 67.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Carthaginian *Councils.*

IT were to be wiſh'd that, when Men built an Argument upon the Teſtimony of an Author, they would diligently read and weigh him, and be ſure to underſtand him too before they pretend to bring him forth as a Witneſs unto the matter in Controverſy: And alſo that they would let him ſpeak the Whole Truth. But in the next inſtance Mr. *O.* ſeems to have overlook'd both theſe neceſſary Precautions, and has at Adventures produc'd a Scrap of a Teſtimony in favour of himſelf, as he thinks, but which in the end will prove fatal to his Cauſe, and will confirm the World in the Belief, that he is either very raſh and ignorant in his own Quotations, or that he will ſtick at nothing, ſo he may ſeem to ſupport his own Opinion.

* P. 159. † An. 397. The Fathers (*ſays He**) in the ſecond Council of *Carthage*, *Anno* 428† did obſerve, "That until that time ſome Dioceſſes never had any Biſhops at all, and thereupon Ordained, "they ſhould have none for the future. They would never have made ſuch "a Canon, had they concluded the Government by Biſhops to be *Jure* "*Divino.*

I agree with Mr. *O.* in the Deduction he has made, provided the Premiſes were true. To make theſe good, therefore he quotes that Canon aforeſaid thus— *plebes ut Dioceſes, quæ nunquam Epiſcopos acceperunt, non habeant.* Whoever firſt formed this Argument againſt Epiſcopacy, has groſly abuſed his Reader and the the Council too. Mr. *O.* perhaps borrowed it of Mr. *Baxter* or ſome ſuch kind of Author, whoſe Intereſt and Partiality will not ſuffer them to let the Reader ſee the whole Period, leaſt at the ſame time he ſhould diſcern the Truth, and themſelves be found Guilty of Falſification, which I doubt not to make out in a few Words.

To which end I will take the Liberty to lay the Canon before the Reader in its own Language. For though the *African* Fathers uſed the Latin Tongue, yet all the Latin Copies among us at this Day were derived from the Greek Verſion, as *Juſtellus* tells us, which is therefore the moſt Authentick, and ought to be accounted of greateſt Authority. The ſaid Canon therefore runs thus—*Ἔδοξεν, ἵνα τὰ πλήθη τὰ ἐν ταῖς παροικίαις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπισκόπων κατεχόμενα τὸ ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον μηδέποτε ἐσχηκότα, εἰ μὴ κατὰ τὴν θέλησιν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου παρ' οὗ ἀρχῆς κατέχονται, μὴ λαμβάνωσιν ἰθύνοντας ἰδίους, τουτ' ἔστιν ἐπισκόπους.* In *Engliſh* thus——"It was determined that the People in the Dioceſſes (*not the Dioceſſes*) "having formerly belong'd to Biſhops, but never having had a proper "Biſhop of their own, ſhould not have (*now for the Future*) their own "proper Rectors, that's to ſay Biſhops, except by the Conſent of that Biſhop "under whoſe Juriſdiction (*at preſent*) they are. From whence it appears 1. That the People here ſpoken of were aforetime Subject to Biſhops, which Mr. *O.* has miſerably perverted by ſaying, that—till that time *the Dioceſſes* never had any Biſhops at all, contrary to the apparent ſenſe of that Canon, which affirms it

it, and deſcribes thoſe People thus—ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπισκόπων κατεχόμενα and again ὑπὸ τῆς (ἐπισκόπων) ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατείχοντο, that is, the People here ſpoken of were even in the poſſeſſion, and under the Juriſdiction of Biſhops: *Ex. gra.* To make the matter plainer to Mr. *O.* The People of *Lancaſhire* cannot be ſaid never to have had any Biſhops at all, it being well known that the Biſhop of *Cheſter* is their Dioceſan. 2. The People mentioned in the Canon had not ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον a proper Biſhop peculiar to themſelves. Thus it is true, that the County of *Lancaſter* never had to this Day a proper Biſhop of their own. 3. The *African* Fathers did not Peremptorily reſolve that thoſe People ſhould have no Biſhop for the future, though Mr. *O.* has very falſly affirmed it. But two things they define, either firſt that they ſhould continue in ſubjection to their former Biſhop, that is to keep to my Example, that the County of *Lancaſter* ſhould continue as a Member of the Dioceſs of *Cheſter*: Or elſe ſecondly, that they ſhould be erected into a Diſtinct Biſhoprick, and have their own proper Biſhop, provided nevertheleſs that it be with the Conſent of their former Biſhop, or thus in the Example, that the County of *Lancaſter* ſhould be made a Biſhoprick by its ſelf, and have a proper Biſhop of its own, provided my Lord of *Cheſter* would conſent thereunto. There is another Canon, in the *African* *Code* which is more full to my purpoſe———"It pleaſed the "Synod that the People, who never had proper Biſhops of their "own, ſhould not have them, Except it be ſo decreed in a full Provincial Synod, "and (*particularly*) by the Primate, and with the Conſent of that Biſhop, unto "whoſe Government that Church (*or the aforeſaid People*) formerly belonged. Mr. *O.* then, if he had dealt honeſtly and faithfully with the *African* Fathers and with us, ſhould have cited the whole Period at length, and not abuſed them, and endeavoured to cozen the preſent Age with ſuch Counterfeit Stuff. I have this only farther to remark upon theſe Canons of the *Carthaginian* Councils (and ſo ſhall conclude), that the Occaſion of making the former (and of the latter too as is probable) was the Ambitious and Haughty, and Aſpiring, Stubborn and Fooliſh (for all theſe Epithets are there beſtowed on them) Diſpoſition of ſome Presbyters, who raiſing their Creſts againſt their own Biſhops, and Wheedling the People by ſome indirect means, would needs in a Diſorderly manner make themſelves their Rectors *i. e.* Biſhops. This immediately follows in the aforeſaid Canon as any one that pleaſes may ſee at his Leiſure.

Can. 98. An. 407.

To prove that Presbyters have power to impoſe Hands in Ordination Mr. *O.* alledges * the 4th Council of *Carthage* † *Can.* 3.———*Omnes Presbyteri qui Praeſentes ſunt, Manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput illius* (*Ordinandi Presbyteri*) *teneant.*

* P. 88.

† Held Anno 436.

Anſ. 1 He has not given us the Canon intire having left out ſomething, which perhaps will go a great way to the overthrowing his Argument, as will be ſeen anon. Thus the Canon runs—*Epiſcopo eum* (ſc. *Presbyterum*) *benedicente Omnes*, &c. But it is not unuſual for Mr. *O.* to quote his Authors by Halves, and to ſuppreſs, what ſeems to make againſt him. At this rate he may ſoon get the Chriſtian World on his ſide, ſo many of 'em at leaſt as will not be at the pains or are unable to examine his Authorities.

2. This Canon, though *Caranza* and other Authors mention it, is not to be found in the *African Code* ſet forth by *Juſtellus*, which makes me ſuſpect, that the Fathers, who in the Council of *Trull*, took the *African* into the *Code* of the Univerſal Church, look'd upon it either as Spurious, or rejected it as to the matter therein decreed. But I will not inſiſt on this.

3. It is moſt reaſonable to interpret one Canon by another. The ſaid Council decreed.——— *Ut Epiſcopus ſine Concilio Clericorum ſuorum Clericos non Ordinet.* From whence one would gueſs that the Impoſition of the Presbyters Hands was deſigned only as a Teſtimony, that the Biſhop Ordained with the advice and conſent of the Preſbyters, at leaſt not without them.

Can. 22.

4. If Presbyters laid on Hands as proper Ordainers, how comes it to paſs that in other Councils and Canons of the Church its declared that the Biſhop only Ordains and not the Presbyters? In the 2. Council of *Hiſp. Can.* 6.——— *Epiſcopus enim ſacerdotibus & Miniſtris ſolus Honorem dare poteſt.* Can. 7. *Nam quamvis cum Epiſcopis plurima illis (Presbyteris) Myſteriorum Communis ſit Diſpenſatio; quædam tamen ſibi prohibita noverint, ſicut Presbyterorum & Diaconorum Conſecratio.* But the fifth Canon is remarkable. The Occaſion of it was this. A certain Biſhop being Blind, laid on his Hands at the Ordination of ſome Preſbyters and Deacons with the reſt of his Presbyters; & *Presbyter quidem illis contra Eccleſiaſticum Ordinem benedictionem dediſſe fertur.* For which ('tis added that) the Presbyter deſerved to be condemned, but that he was in the mean time dead. From whence I think 'tis plain, 1. That Ordination was not effectually given by Impoſition of Hands, but by Benediction the Charge or Commiſſion (wherein properly conſiſted the Ordination) which was given to the Ordained. 2. All the Irregularity here committed was, that the Presbyter preſum'd *Benedicere*, and there with it may be to give the Commiſſion, that is to Ordain, which if Impoſition of Hands was Ordination, had been no Irregularity at leaſt no Eſſential defect, as it is declared to be. 3. For if Impoſition of Hands be the Ordination, then there was no Irregularity in theſe Ordinations, the Biſhop having laid his Hands on the Ordained, as 'tis teſtifyed in the Canon, as well as that Preſbyter, who bleſt him. 4. The Orders thus conferred were declared Null by the Council——— *Hi (Presbyteri & Diaconi) gradum ſacerdotii & Levitici Ordinis quem perverſe adepti ſunt, amittant.* So that from the whole it appears, that in the Judgment of theſe Fathers and of the Church at that Time, laying on of Hands was not properly Ordination, and by Conſequence, though Presbyters impoſe Hands, yet they do not Ordain, which utterly overthrows Mr. *O*'s Major Propoſition.

But let us ſee how Mr. *O.* confirms his Major, He endeavours it by this *Medium*——— *That which is an Ordaining Act beſpeaks an Ordaining Power: But Impoſition of Hands is an Ordaining Act. Therefore, &c.* To the Minor I anſwer by denying Impoſition of Hands to be an Ordaining Act, 'tis only an outward and Solemn Concomitant of it, as is before Evinc'd though Warranted by Holy Scripture. By the Impoſition of the Biſhops and Presbyters Hands is ſignifyed to the Congregation preſent, that the Biſhop Ordains the Perſon with the advice Conſent and Council of his Presbyters.

P. 89.

But

But Mr. *O.* adds, " I ſhould be glad to ſee one Inſtance given in the Apoſtles " days, of Perſons laying on of Hands in Ordination, that had no Ordaining " Power.

If I ſhould affirm that thoſe mentioned 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. impoſed Hands, but had no Ordaining Power, I am very ſure he can't diſprove me : And if I ſhould demand one Inſtance in the Apoſtles times of meer Presbyters laying on of hands, or Ordaining without a Biſhop ; I am ſure Mr. *O.* cannot produce it. But Mr. *O.* pleads* How then comes the Biſhops to urge the Scripture? (1 *Tim.* 5. 22.) *Lay hands ſuddenly on no Man, in favour of Timothy's Ordaining Power, and thence to infer that he was Biſhop of* Epheſus, *ſince he might lay on Hands, and yet have no Ordaining Power, nor be Biſhop.*

* *P.* 90.

This difficulty is eaſily reſolved. If there were no other Argument for *Timothy's* Epiſcopal Power in the Church of *Epheſus* ; but that Text only, it might thence be fairly inferred, that *Timothy* was Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and had the Power of Ordaining, becauſe no other are joyn'd in Commiſſion with him ; nevertheleſs, though this prov'd it not, it may be evinc'd from other pregnant Paſſages in thoſe Epiſtles to *Timothy*, which I need not repeat.

Nor do we acknowledge Presbyters may perform all the outward Acts of Ordination ; That of Benediction belongs not to them at all.

But (ſays he) *what does the Presbyters impoſing of Hands ſignifie, if not an Ordaining Power?* I have told him already, it denotes their Approbation, and that the Biſhop Ordains with their Advice and Conſent : *No,* (he replys *) *they could ſignifie their Approbation ſome other way without impoſition of Hands, as by ſaying* Amen *to the Ordination Prayers.*

* *P.* 91.

But this is to be wiſer than God and his Apoſtles, who have (as I often have ſuppoſed, though I need not grant it) recommended this way, which adds an agreeable Solemnity unto the Action ; at leaſt the Church has thought fit to admit the Presbyters to lay on Hands, and thereby to ſignify their Approbation (of ſuch as are taken into their own proper Miniſtry) in a particular way and different from the Peoples teſtifying their Aſſent. And this is the reaſon why at the Ordination of a Deacon, Presbyters were not to impoſe Hands, *ſc. Quia non ad Sacerdotium ſed ad Miniſterium Conſecratur,* * as the *African* Fathers declared. In ſhort, this Canon compar'd with others, which appropriate the Power of Ordaining Presbyters unto Biſhops only, (as is above obſerv'd) ſeems to me to ſhew, that in the judgment of the Ancients, Presbyters had no Inherent Original Power of laying on Hands, but that 'twas granted to them by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution only. Otherwiſe, probably they would have had Power of Impoſition of Hands at the Ordination of Deacons alſo. Briefly, becauſe in the Proſecution of this Argument Mr. *O.* appeals to the Scripture ſo oft for proof of certain things that fell in his way whilſt he was managing this Point ; I do once more here deſire, what I have often call'd for, one ſingle probable proof, or Example from Scripture of bare ordinary Presbyters Ordaining, or laying on of Hands without ſome Superior preſiding in the Action,

* *Con. Carth.* 4. *Can.* 3.

5. And to conclude this Diſcourſe about the Councils of *Carthage*, I that am not much concern'd about Men's Opinions, nor whether the Presbyters impoſe Hands *tanquam Ordinantes*, or *tanquam Approbantes* only, am very well content e-

very one ſhould abound in his own ſenſe, provided there be an Agreement in Practice, and an occaſion be not thereby taken to raiſe Schiſms and Emulations in the Church. Let this matter be bang'd in the Schools ſo long as Criticks ſhall pleaſe, yet ſeeing there is no colour for aſſerting Presbyters to be Ordainers without the Biſhop, whatever they be with him, I make no difficulty to affirm that their Ordinations without the Biſhop, are without Precedent, either in Scripture or Antiquity, and by conſequence, in themſelves Null and Invalid: A partial Cauſe can never produce the intire Effect.

Mr. *O.* being about to eſtabliſh the Ordaining Power of the Presbyters, inſtances in the 22d Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage*, wherein it is Decreed: "That Biſhops muſt not Ordain without their Presbyters, as Presbyters not "without Biſhops, that therefore he may as well ſay Biſhops have no Po-"wer to Ordain, becauſe they could not Ordinarily do it without their Presby-"ters: As we affirm Presbyters have no Power to Ordain, becauſe they can't "Ordain without Biſhops.

Anſ. Let us ſee the Canon at length * — *Ut Epiſcopus ſine Concilio Clericorum ſuorum Clericos non Ordinet, ita ut* &c. It is hence apparent that the Biſhop Ordain'd, and not the Presbyters, though he was to take along with him the Counſel and Advice of his Prebyters. Let Mr. *O.* produce me a Canon to this Effect, *Presbyteri ſine Concilio Epiſcopi ſui Clericos non Ordinent*, and then it will be time for us to think of a further Anſwer unto this Cavil.

* *Apud Caranz. Conc. Carth.* 4.

Mr. *O.* urges * farther the following Canon; † "The Biſhop may hear no Man's Cauſe without the Preſence of his "Clergy: Otherwiſe the Biſhop's Sentence ſhall be void, un-"leſs it be confirm'd in their Preſence. This we can aſſent unto without Prejudice to our main Cauſe. But I read no where that the Presbyter's Sentence ſhall be void without the Preſence of the Biſhop: The reaſon is, becauſe the Presbyters gave no Sentence at all.

* *Def.* p. 117.
† *Can.* 23d.

Mr. *O.* to confirm his Maxim that Lay-Men were allow'd to Preach, at the Requeſt of the Clergy cites * the *Carthaginian* Canon. — *A Lay-Man may not dare to Preach, whilſt the Clergy are preſent, unleſs they ask him.*

* *Def.* p. 63. *Con. Carth.* 4. *Can.* 98.

Anſ. I have given my Opinion of this Matter before. It affects the Presbyters as well as the Biſhops, and is of as much force againſt Mr. *O.* (unleſs he'll turn *Quaker*) as againſt the Rector. But over and above I note this Canon is not taken into the univerſal Code, and therefore was rejected in the Council of *Trull*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Paphnutius and Daniel.

THE next thing Mr. *O.* urges in behalf of Presbyters Ordaining is the Story, which *Joannes Caſſianus* tells of one *Paphnutius*, a Presbyter Abbot, who made *Daniel* his deſign'd Succeſſor, a Deacon firſt, and then *Coæquare ſibi etiam Sacerdotis honore feſtinavit —Optanſq; ſibi Succeſſionem digniſſimam providere eum Presbyterii honore provexit.* He adds, "That *Theophilus* then Biſhop of *Alexandria*, did not pronounce the Ordination null that we read of, nor any other in "that time. Had it been either irregular, or unuſual, doubtleſs it had been "Cenſur'd.

Anno 390

Page 131.

Anſ. It muſt not be deny'd but that this Inſtance of Presbyters Ordaining appears the faireſt of all others that Mr. *O.* has muſter'd up in his *Plea*. Nevertheleſs, what I have to reply, is as follows.

1. It is but a ſingle Inſtance of a (for ought I know) Humourſome Abbot, who took upon him to do this contrary to the known and eſtabliſh'd Order of the Catholick Church, and particularly, of the *Alexandrian*, whereof he is ſuppoſed to have been a part: The Deſert of *Scetis*, where he uſually reſided, adjoining to the Lake *Maria*, or *Maris*, which borders on *Egypt*.

2. Whereas 'tis urged, that *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *did not pronounce this Ordination void and null that we read of*, there is no great matter in this. For it may with as great reaſon be argued, that *Theophilus* would have Cenſured it, if it had come to his knowledge, there being no probability that *Theophilus* would have paſt by ſuch a Diſorder and Affront done to the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, ſeeing *Peter* and *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, his Predeceſſors, would not bear with the *Melitians*.

3. 'Tis wonderful that Mr. *O.* ſhould Inſinuate that it was neither irregular, nor unuſual, which in former Caſes he has granted over and over again.

4. *Valeſius* tells me,* that *Paphnutius* was engaged in the *Melitian* Schiſm, as *Epiphanius* teſtifies, *de Hæreſ. Melitianorum*. He alſo obſerves, that the Schiſm was then improv'd unto Hereſie. 'Tis no wonder then that an Heretical Schiſmatick ſhould preſume to break through the Rules and Orders of that Church, from which he divided, and uſurp a Power that nothing belonged to him. And hence alſo may be drawn the reaſon why *Theophilus* took no notice of what *Paphnutius* did, he being a Schiſmatick, (if not an Heretick) and out of the Communion of the Church; and what had the Patriarch to do to judge them that were without already? As St. *Paul* ſpeaks in ſomewhat a like Caſe. But

* *Annot. in Soc.* p. 7. & 112.

1 *Cor.* 5. 12.

5. I will not content my ſelf with theſe Anſwers, though I reckon them ſufficient: But add, 'tis no where affirmed by *Caſſianus* that *Paphnutius* Ordained *Daniel* a Deacon, or Presbyter; but only *Cum Daniel multis junior eſſet ætate ad Diaconii* prælatus *eſt Officium*, and then *Feſtinavit coæquare*,

quare, made haſte to equal Daniel *with himſelf in the Honour of the Prieſt-hood.* And *Laſtly*, deſiring to provide a moſt worthy Succeſſor to himſelf whilſt he was alive, *Provexit promoted* him to the Honour of the Presbyterſhip. The Queſtion is whether theſe Words ſignifie that *Paphnutius* Ordained *Daniel.* That he did ſo, can no ways be concluded from this Teſtimony of *Caſſianus*. For,

1. It has been ordinary to attribute that unto a Perſon, which indeed he only commanded, or directed, deviſed, or procured to be done. Thus Parents are commonly ſaid to *make* their Sons Miniſters, but Ordain them not themſelves. Thus Patrons among us *make* and *prefer* Vicars and Rectors of Churches (and the King Biſhops) though Biſhops Ordain and Inſtitute them. Thus *Joſhua* made him ſharp Knives, and Circumciſed the Children of *Iſrael.* *Joſhua* 5. 3. Now I hope Mr. *O.* will not affirm that *Joſhua* himſelf *made* the ſharp Knives, or Circumciſed all theſe *Iſraelites* with his own hands. But to come yet nearer to our purpoſe, I read in St. *Cyprian* * *Novatus Feliciſſimum nec permittente me nec ſciente ſua factione & ambitione Diaconum conſtituit.*

* *Cyp. Ep.* 52.

The enquiry is, whether *Novatus*, a Presbyter, impoſed hands and *Ordained Feliciſſimus*, a Deacon, and whether St. *Cyprian* is thus to be underſtood. This doubt is to be reſolv'd from another paſſage of St. *Cyprian* in the ſame Epiſtle. *Qui* (*Novatus*) *iſthic* (Carthagine) *Diaconum* fecerat *ſc. Feliciſſimum, illic* (Romæ) *Epiſcopum* fecit, *ſc. Novatianum.* Novatus *made* Feliciſſimus a Deacon at *Carthage*, and *Novatianus* a Biſhop at *Rome*. But how? Not *Ordaining* him himſelf, but procuring, or encouraging him to be Ordained by Biſhops, as we read in *Euſebius* * — *Novatianus*, a Presbyter of *Rome*, (by *Euſ.* called *Novatus* alſo) having from ſome remote parts of *Italy* invited three Biſhops unto *Rome*, forced them to Ordain him (*Novatianus*) Biſhop. This was the Contrivance of the *African Novatus*, as we learn from *Cyprian*. As then *Novatus* did not *Ordain Novatianus*, but three Biſhops procured for the purpoſe; ſo neither can it be thought he *Ordained Feliciſſimus* Deacon, but by his Policy and Intereſt got him to be Ordained: And yet *Cyprian* witneſſeth that he *made* (*fecit & conſtituit*) the one a Deacon, and *made* (*fecit*) the other a Biſhop. In like manner *Paphnutius made Daniel* a Deacon and a Presbyter, that is appointed and commanded him to take Orders. For being the Abbot, he had the Authority to determine his own Monk unto the Orders of Deacon and Presbyter. But

* *Euſ.* E. H. l. 6. c. 43.

It may not be amiſs to conſider what *Blondel* has from this Teſtimony of *Caſſianus* advanced * for the eſtabliſhment of Presbyterian Ordination. He places this fact in the Year 390. when the *Egyptian* Church enjoyed a profound Peace, and *Theophilus* was Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and the Government of this Church was improved in a manner into a Secular Dominion. "If in theſe Circumſtances (*He argues*) a Presbyter "might Ordain Presbyters, how much more before the ancient ſimplicity of the "Goſpel was ſhackled with Novel Conſtitutions.

* *Apol.* 358.

Anſ. It is is ſome prejudice againſt this Story of *Caſſianus*, that neither *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret*, nor any of thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, though they mention *Paphnutius*, ſhould have one Syllable of this Action, nor ſo much as mention *Daniel*. Beſides the *Egyptian* Churches were not in ſo perfect Tranquility, as Mr. *Blondel* imagines, and repreſents them. The *Meletian* Schiſm ſtill remained among them, and this *Paphnutius* was one of them, as I have before obſerv'd;

ſerved; ſo that it is not be wondered at, that *Paphnutius* preſumed to Ordain, and *Theophilus* overlook'd, and neglected it. For what had he to do with them that were already out of the Church and Excommunicated, as the *Melitians* muſt needs be ſuppoſed. This premiſed I frame an Argument againſt *Blondel*, and (as I conceit) every whit as good as his. 'Tis this. "If in the moſt Turbulent "State of the *Egyptian* Church, when *Alexander* was Biſhop of *Alexandria*, the "Ordinations of *Melitius* and *Colluthus* were declared invalid, it is Morally im-"poſſible that the Ordination of *Daniel* by *Paphnutius*, ſhould be approved or "connived at, when *Theophilus* being Biſhop of *Alexandria*, the Epiſcopacy was "raiſed to a higher degree of Grandeur, and the Peace of the Church better "eſtabliſhed.

To conclude this Chapter, let it be remembred, what I have already noted out of *Theodoret*, how that Biſhops were wont to reſide among the Monks in the Wilderneſs of *Egypt*, and that ſeven of them are ſaid to have done ſo from their Youth up, to their extreme Old Age, even when they were Biſhops; and a little Senſe will perſwade one to believe, that *Daniel* was Ordained by a Biſhop, *Paphnutius* the Abbot commanding and directing his Monk to receive Holy Orders.

Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 22.

CHAP. XV.

Of Pope Leo's *Dacree.*

THE caſe was this. There were was in the Dioceſs of *Ruſticus* Biſhop of *Narbons* (as may be conjectured from Pope *Leo*'s Epiſtle) ſome Perſons, who toook upon 'em to Ordain, and who are called by that Pope *Pſeudo Epiſcopi*. *Ruſticus* complains thereof in a Letter to *Leo*, which is not extant that I know of. *Leo*'s Anſwer is —— "There is no reaſon they ſhould be "accounted Biſhops, who were neither choſen by the Clergy, nor deſired "by the People, nor Conſecrated by the Provincial Biſhops at the ap-"pointment of the Metropolitan. Whence, when the Queſtion often "ariſes concerning the Honour (*he means Epiſcopacy, and the Power of Ordaining*) "who can doubt that, what does not appear to have been *truly* Conferred, is in "no wiſe to be given by thoſe *Pſeudo Epiſcopi*. But if any Clergy-Man in thoſe "Churches, which belong unto their own proper Biſhop, have been Ordain-"ed by thoſe *Pſeudo Epiſcopi*, and the Ordination was performed with the Con-"ſent and appointment of the Preſidents (*or proper Biſhops*) it may be ratify'd; "provided they remain in thoſe Churches. This Pope *Leo* flouriſhed about the Year 442.

Now Mr. *O*, who alledges, this Decree of Pope *Leo* againſt us, is upon the Proof of Presbyters Ordaining, which I do not ſee is in the leaſt favoured by theſe Words, except he will affirm thoſe *Pſeudo Epiſcopi* were Presbyters only. When Mr. *O*. ſhall have proved this, I ſhall think my

P. 131.

my ſelf oblig'd to return an Anſwer to it, and not before. In the mean while I obſerve Mr. *O.* leaving his Argument adduces this Paſſage to throw dirt upon our Eſtabliſh'd Biſhops, and prove 'em to be uncanonically Ordained, inſtead of Confirming his own dear Presbyterian Ordination: But let us ſee what He ſays.

" Two things are remarkable in the deciſion of *Leo the Great.* 1. That our " *Engliſh* Biſhops wanting two of the requiſites mentioned in the Popes Decree, " *ſc. The Election of the Clergy, and the demand of the People,* their Ordinations " therefore have a Canonical Nullity in them, and our *Engliſh* Biſhops would " have been reckoned *Pſeudo Epiſcopi* in *Leo's* time. Upon which remark I make the following Reflexions.

1. We are beholden to Mr. *O.* for making his ſimple Friends believe that we are departed from the decrees of the Popes. From henceforth then let them not reproach our Biſhops for Popiſh.

2. Mr. *O.* is in the right. Pope *Leo* perhaps would have called our Biſhops *Pſeudo Epiſcopi*: I am ſure at this Day the Popes do not fail to condemn 'em as ſuch. 3. The uncanonical Ordination of Biſhops among us, will not excuſe that of the Presbyterians, much leſs juſtify their Anti-Scriptural Ordinations. No one can defend himſelf by Recrimination: But a greater fault can never be excuſed by a leſſer. 4. We are ſo far from tying up our ſelves to the ſtrict obſervation of *Papal* or Provincial Canons, that we think not our ſelves abſolutely oblig'd to the Obſervation of the Decrees of the Oecumenical Synods, but take Libery to vary from them, when ever neceſſity or great convenience invites us to it: Otherwiſe we endeavour to conform our ſelves to them, as much as is poſſible. 5. I have more than once in the Preface to *I. N.* and in the former part of this Treatiſe (I hope) ſufficiently evinc'd, that *our Biſhops want neither the Election of the Clergy, nor the Conſent of the People,* and therefore their Ordinations on that ſcore have no Canonical Nullity in them. But.

2. Mr. *O.* remarks from the foreſaid Decree of Pope *Leo,* " That the conſent " of the true Biſhops *ex poſt facto* made the Ordination of meer Presbyters lawful, " which could not be unleſs Presbyters had an intrinſick Power of Ordination. Hereunto I return.

1. Mr. *O.* ought firſt to prove that theſe *Pſeudo Epiſcopi* were meer Presbyters. I am otherwiſe perſwaded and think I can evince it out of *Leo's* Decree. 2. The conſent of the true Biſhops was not required *ex poſt facto* (that's the diſingenuous and falſe Gloſs of an Adverſary) but antecedent to the Ordination, as appears from theſe Words, & *(ſi) Ordinatio Clericorum conſenſu & judicio Præſidentium facta eſt, if the Ordination of the Miniſters was made with the Conſent and appointment of the Biſhops.* Let any Man of underſtanding judge whether this Conſent and appointment of the Provincial Biſhops, was to be Antecedent to the Ordinations or to follow them. 3. Whereas Mr. *O.* renders *Pſeudo Epiſcopi falſe Biſhops* as it were in oppoſition to *true* Biſhops (ſo he renders *proprios Epiſcopos*) 'tis I think a miſtake. The proper Biſhops being the Biſhops of the Dioceſſes within the Provinces, and by conſequence the *Pſeudo Epiſcopi,* ſuch as had no Dioceſs there, and therefore could not Ordain regularly without the conſent and appointment of the proper Biſhops of the Dioceſſes: Of which I have ſpoken before. Upon the Whole matter, how Mr. *O.* will be able to infer hence, that Ordination by meer Presbyters can be lawful, or that they have an intrinſick

Power

Power to Ordain, I am yet to learn. If theſe *Pſeudo Epiſcopi* were real Biſhops, as they muſt have been, if their Ordinations were valid when the proper Biſhops conſent was firſt obtained, what is this to the Advantage of Preſbyterian Ordination? For who will believe the Pope of *Rome* at this time of Day, *viz.* in the middle of the 5th Century would decree any thing that might Countenance the Ordinations of meer Preſbyters? This is plain, that though the Pope called 'em *Pſeudo Epiſcopi*, yet they reckon themſelves real Biſhops, and not meer Preſbyters: Which is a ſtrong preſumption that in thoſe times, meer Presbyters were not allowed to Ordain. For to what purpoſe elſe ſhould they aſſume the Title and Character of Biſhops? Our Preſbyterians do not think there is any need for them to uſurp the Title of Biſhops, and that becauſe they believe themſelves to have Power of Ordination, as Preſbyters. All the Difficulty is why *Leo* calls 'em *Pſeudo Epiſcopi*, if they were real Biſhops.

Anſ. The reaſon hereof I conceive is, becauſe they had been Ordained Biſhops, but were not poſſeſſed of any Dioceſſes in thoſe Provinces, and yet took upon them to Act there, which they ought not to have done, it being contrary to the peace and eſtabliſh'd Order of the Church. This appears from the firſt Words of the Decree. "There is no reaſon they ſhould be accounted Biſhops "(*that is have Liberty to Act as Biſhops in theſe Dioceſſes and Provinces*) who "were neither choſen by the Clergy, nor deſired by the People, nor Conſe-"crated by the Provincial Biſhops at the appointment of the Metropolitan. From theſe Words 'tis plain that he ſpeaks not of meer Preſbyters: For it was never required by any Eccleſiaſtical Canon, that meer Presbyters were to be Ordained *by the Provincial Biſhops with the Conſent of the Metropolitan.* This Eccleſiaſtical Rule and Conſtitution concerned Biſhops only. So that I reckon the Pope called them *Pſeudo Epiſcopi*, not becauſe they were not Ordained Biſhops, but becauſe they acted irregularly in other Biſhops Dioceſſes.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Churches in the Iſland of Taprobane.

WE are come now to the Year 520. when (ſays Mr. *O.*) "In the Iſland of *Taprobane*, or * *Zeilan*, as 'tis now "called, there was a Church of Chriſtians governed by a "Presbyter and his Deacon, without any Superiour Biſhop to whom he or his "Flock was Subject. This Iſland is above 2000 Miles in Compaſs, a Province "big enough for a Biſhop, yet had none in *Juſtin* the Emperor's time, which "was about the Year 520. but was under the Juriſdiction of a Presbyter Or-"dained in *Perſia*, who in all likelyhood Ordained his Succeſſor, and would not "be at the trouble of ſending for one to very remote Countries: From hence Mr. *O.* roundly concludes——*that Biſhops were not thought Eſſential to Churches, no not in the 6th Age, and that meer Presbyters have power of Juriſdiction, and conſe-*

P. 158.

* Or *Ceylon.*

 quently

ſurely of Ordination. I'll not now conteſt the Truth of the Story; Let us rather ſuppoſe the matter of Fact to be as it is reported by Mr. *O*—— But I have theſe following things to reply to it, and to the concluſion drawn from it.

1. How does Mr. *O.* know that this Presbyter and his Deacon, and the flock of Chriſtians belonging to 'em were without a Superior Biſhop, to whom they were Subject? They might be ſubject to ſome Biſhop in *Perſia*, for any thing he can tell or the firſt Relator ſays. 'Tis true, this Presbyter *regebat*, he did rule the flock, but it might be under ſome Biſhop; the likelihood hereof is the greater, becauſe he was Ordained in *Perſia*, and from thence ſent to propagate the Goſpel.

2. Whereas Mr. *O.* thinking to magnify the Power of Presbyters, and to ſhew what vaſt Churches have been rul'd by them without Biſhops, acquaints us that this Iſland is (or was) 2000 Miles in Compaſs, and that it was *big enough for a Biſhop*, it might not be unſeaſonable to aſk him firſt, whether he is not miſtaken in the extent of the Iſland. *Heylin* makes it but 700 or 800 at moſt. Well but I'l not ſtand with Mr. *O.* for 1200 or 1300 Miles; Almoſt two thirds ſhall not break Squares between him and me, eſpecially ſince he has ſo good a Geographer on his ſide as *N. Lloyd*; granting then this. 2. Neither his Country-Man *Lloyd*, nor *Heylin* make any mention of Chriſtians in this Iſland. The ſtory then may be but a Fable at laſt. 3. I aſk whether there were any more than one ſingle Congregation of Chriſtians in this Iſland, or more than one Presbyter and his Deacon. If not he has the reaſon why there was no Biſhop in the Iſland; but that the Presbyter and his Flock were ſubject unto ſome *Perſian* Biſhop. If he ſays there were Chriſtians up and down in the Iſland (as his telling us of the large compaſs of it ſeems to intimate) and many Congregations, and yet this Presbyter ruled 'em all, why then we have a real, though not nominal Biſhop, I mean in reſpect of Juriſdiction. 4. Whereas Mr. *O.* makes this Reflection, that this Iſland in Compaſs 2000 Miles, was a Province big enough for a Biſhop, he'll give me leave (I hope) to retort, that it ſeems it was not too big for one Presbyter and his Deacon.

3. Let it be obſerved, that Mr. *O.* knows not but this Presbyter had a Predeceſſor in that Iſland: For there is a Tradition that *Philip* the Evangeliſt preached the Goſpel in *Perſia*, *India* and *Taprobane*. I demand then upon that ſuppoſition, who Ordained his Predeceſſor? A Biſhop in *Perſia* in likelihood; for ſo much is reaſonably gathered from this Presbyter's being him-
Zoſ. l. 2. c. 9. 14.
ſelf Ordained there; and Biſhops were before that time in *Perſia*. If ſo, there is more Probability that this Presbyters Succeſſor alſo was Ordained in *Perſia*, than that the Presbyter himſelf Ordained him. But theſe things are all in the dark, and we know not certainly that this Presbyter had either a Predeceſſor or a Succeſſor, and ſo Mr. *O*'s whole Argument is loſt: He has built upon no Foundation: It tumbles down of its own accord. Fifthly, 'Tis likely this Church in *Taprobane* increaſed not much, nor continued long, there being no Monument of a Chriſtian Church there, but the Monk *Coſme's* Tale of this ſingle Presbyter.

4. Since we muſt contend with likelihoods, I aſk whether it be not much more likely, that this Presbyter being Ordained in *Perſia*, did take care rather, that his Succeſſor (if he had any) ſhould be there Ordained likewiſe, than that himſelf ſhould preſume to Ordain Him. There is not any the leaſt ground to conjecture

jecture, that the Presbyter himſelf Ordained Him; but there is ſome to think that his Succeſſor was Ordained in *Perſia*, *viz.* becauſe he himſelf was.

5. Admitting that the Church of Chriſt in this Iſland of *Taprobane* continued there for ſome Ages, if it increaſed not much (which is moſt likely becauſe we hear nothing more of it) it might depend upon and remain ſubject unto ſome *Perſian* Biſhop, and be under his Guidance and direction, as our Weſtern Iſlands are under the Biſhop of *London*. If it flouriſh'd and Chriſtians multiply'd conſiderably there, who can tell but they had Biſhops of their own afterwards?

The ſumm of the matter is —— *A certain Monk called* Coſmas (a Man of no Note and Reputation that I know of) *tells a lame ſtory of a Presbyter* (without a Name, which renders the Tale Suſpicious) *who in the Year* 520, (when all the World beſides was confeſſedly Epiſcopal) *was Ordained in Perſia* (where the Government of the Church was Epiſcopal) *and ruled a Church in Zeilan* (no one knows how Numerous, or how long he ruled it, nor how long it continued a Church) *without a Superiour Biſhop* (ſays Mr. *O.* which is more than is teſtify'd by the Relators) *and in all likelihood Ordained his own Succeſſor, and would not be at the Trouble of ſending for one to very Remote Countries* (all which is ſpoken at Random, it being in the ſtory not ſo much as intimated that he had any Succeſſor, or that he Ordained him, or that he was unwilling to get a Succeſſor from a remote Country). And from hence without any Colour of pretence very raſhly, and very weakly Mr. *O.* has gather'd *that even in the 6th Century, Biſhops were thought Eſſential, and that now Presbyters have Power to Ordain.* If this muſt paſs for a tolerable Argument againſt Epiſcopal Government, or in the leaſt favours the Presbyterian, I do renounce all pretence to common Senſe.

CHAP. XVII.

Of Pelagius *his Ordination.*

WE have now been a long Journey in ſearch after ſome Inſtance of Presbyters Ordaining, or ſome Law and Cuſtom that warrants it: We have been in *Africa*, and among the *Moors* in *Egypt*, and the Deſert of *Scetis*, at *Taprobane*, which lies to *Eaſt-India*, among the Northern *Scythians*, in *England*, and in *France*, and among the *Picts*, and *Scots*, in the moſt remote parts of *Britain*: We have examined the moſt famous Councils and their Definitions, of *Nice*, of *Ancyra*, *Antioch*, and the *Carthaginian* Synods, and all to as little purpoſe as they who ſeek a Needle in a Bottle of Hay. We are now at length going to viſit *Limina Apoſtolorum*, *Rome* its ſelf the Centre of Chriſtendom, and thence to learn what may be found in the practice of St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul*'s Succeſſors for Presbyters Power to Ordain: And ſurely we will not decline the determination of this Queſtion, which the Infallible Church has made by her Example. To this purpoſe therefore we are put in Mind of the Ordination of *Pelagius* Biſhop of *Rome*, which happened about the Year 555 and is remembred by *Anaſtaſius*,

De Vit. Pont. P. 140.

Anastaſius; who wrote the lives of the Popes. *Anaſtaſius* then relates, as Mr. *O.* tells me, how that—"*Pelagius* the firſt, "Biſhop of *Rome*, was Ordained by *John* Biſhop of *Peruſia*, "*Bonus* Biſhop of *Florence*, and *Andreas* Presbyter *de Hoſtia*: Whereas by the "Canons three Biſhops are abſolutely neceſſary for the Ordination of a Biſhop. Before I make a direct Anſwer to this and to the Argument, which Mr. *O.* builds upon the Fact it is requiſite, that I tell the ſtory a little more largely. For ſome Men have got a Scurvy Trick to leave out whatever is to their Diſadvantage or Invalidates the Force of their Argument, it being not the Truth but the Intereſt of the Cauſe, which they labour to ſupport. The ſtory then is thus. "*Vigilius*, the Immediate Predeceſſor of *Pelagius* "had been ſeverely Treated at *Conſtantinople*, by *Juſtinian* or ra- "ther *Theodora* his Empreſs; and returning back to *Rome*, fell "Sick, and died. *Pelagius* was ſuſpected to have had an Hand "in his Death *, at leaſt had been his Enemy and a cauſe "of his Sufferings, for which Reaſon the Clergy hated *Pelagius*, "ſo that he could not procure three Biſhops to conſecrate him. "He therefore in the place of the third admitted *Andreas* the Presbyter of *Hoſtia*, "and what will not ſuch a Man as *Pelagius* do to eſtabliſh himſelf in ſo conſide- "rable a Poſt as the Biſhoprick of *Rome*? But if ſuch as theſe ſhall paſs for good Precedents, any Irregularity in the World may at this Rate be Juſtifyed.

Plat. Vita ejus.

* *Anaſta.*

† *Pla. ubi ſupra.*

Thus much being premiſed, let us ſee what uſe Mr. *O.* makes of this Ordination of *Pelagius*. He argues thus—*Either* Pelagius *was no Canonical Biſhop*, &c. *or elſe a Presbyter has Intrinſick Power of Ordination*, &c. that is, either *Pelagius* was no Canonical Biſhop, and then the Succeſſion was interrupted in the Church of *Rome*, and Conſequently the *Engliſh* Biſhops have no Canonical Succeſſion, Or, &c.

Anſ. I reply that though *Pelagius* was no Canonical Biſhop, *i. e.* not Canonically Ordained, yet this notwithſtanding the *Engliſh* Biſhops have true Canonical Succeſſion. For 1. We need not pretend to derive the Succeſſion of our Biſhops from the Popes of *Rome*; 'tis more probable that they are the Succeſſors of St. *Paul* or ſome other Apoſtolical Men, who firſt planted the Goſpel here in the Days of the Apoſtles or ſoon after: So that we are not concerned at any Irregularity ſuppoſed in the *Roman* Succeſſion. 2. We had Biſhops here in *England*, (or *Britain*) long before *Pelagius* was Pope of *Rome*, it being certain that ſome *Britiſh* Biſhops aſſiſted at the Council of *Arles* held in the days of *Conſtantine the Great*, and at that of *Ariminum* called together by *Conſtantius* his Son, above 200 Years before *Pelagius*: And this Race of Biſhops continued even unto *Auſtin* the Monks coming hither. Whatever then becomes of *Pelagius* his Conſecration, 'tis no matter to us: His Irregularity affects not our *Engliſh* Biſhops. 3. Suppoſing (what nevertheleſs is not true) that the Heathen *Saxons*, the *Angli* and the *Danes*, quite extirpated Chriſtianity in this Land, until *Auſtin* the Monk coming from *Rome*, with the Pope's Commiſſion once more reduced, and brought back the Inhabitants of this Iſle unto the belief of the Goſpel, and gave us a new line of Biſhops: Yet ſtill the Irregularity of *Pelagius*'s Conſecration will not at all diſparage our Succeſſion of Biſhops, as Mr. *O.* knows very well, if he would not diſſemble. For I ought to believe that he has read the known Hiſtory of Venerable *Bede*, o'er and o'er, and thoroughly digeſted him, becauſe he ſo oft

and familiarly quotes him in the *Plea, &c.* He may then pleaſe to remember that *Auſtin* was not Created Biſhop by Pope *Gregory*, but by *Etherius* Archbiſhop of *Arles* in *France*— *Interea vir Domini* Auguſtinus *venit* Arelas, & *ab Archiepiſcopo ejuſdem Civitatis* Etherio *juxta quod juſſa Sti. Patris* Gregorii *acceperant, Archiepiſcopus Genti* Anglorum *Ordinatus eſt.* So that from henceforth Mr. *O.* and the Papiſts may take notice that the *Engliſh* Biſhops as to the Succeſſion of their Orders, are nothing beholden to the Biſhops of *Rome*, at leaſt not unto *Pelagius*; that if *Etherius* was a Canonical Biſhop (as I muſt believe till the Contrary is prov'd) ſo was *Auſtin* a Canonical Biſhop, and ſo are our *Engliſh* Biſhops unto this day, whatever becomes of *Pelagius* his Conſecration. Without any farther fear of danger therefore I may Conclude that *Pelagius* was no Canonical Biſhop, that is; was not Canonically Ordained, and yet we have a true Succeſſion of Canonically Ordained Biſhops in *England*. Bed. E. H. l. 1. c. 27.

But Mr. *O.* goes on—*Or elſe he was a Canonical Biſhop*, and what then? Why then it follows, *a Presbyter has a Canonical Power to Ordain* (for ſo *Andreas* had, if *Pelagius* was Canonically Ordain'd) and then by another conſequence, *that Presbyters have an Intrinſick Power to Ordain: Becauſe no Eccleſiaſtical Laws can give to any Order of Men a Canonical Power to that, which they have not an Intrinſical Power to do.* Suppoſing this, (for I need not contend the truth of it) the Anſwer then to the whole Argument is, (as before) that *Pelagius* was not Canonically Ordained.

But now I think on't, what if a Man ſhould affirm that *Pelagius* was Canonically Ordained, and yet affirm, that a Presbyter has not an Intrinſical Power to Ordain? The firſt Apoſtolical Canon decrees——*Let a Biſhop be Ordain'd by two or three Biſhops.* *Pelagius*'s Conſecration therefore was Canonical, being performed by two Biſhops according to this Canon, and Presbyter *Andreas* may ſtand for a Cypher. True, the *Nicene* and other Synods afterwards ſaid by three Biſhops. Nevertheleſs the Apoſtolical Canons being always reckoned as part of the Code of the univerſal Church, the *Nicene* (and all other) Canons ought in conformity to this to be favourably interpreted, I mean that it did not intend peremptorily to command, but rather prudentially adviſed that if it could be, a Biſhop ſhould be Conſecrated by three Biſhops. It is not improbable but *Pelagius*'s Conſecration was upon this very Account afterwards allow'd of. For this is manifeſt, that *Pelagius* (what ever his Ordination was) is not reckoned amongſt the Schiſmatical Biſhops of *Rome*, but was acknowledged, and peaceably ſubmitted to. Mr. *O.* then is too poſitive, when he affirms that —*by the Canons three Biſhops are abſolutely neceſſary for the Ordination of a Biſhop.* Without all peradventure, fewer might ſerve in caſes of Neceſſity, as this haply afterwards might be judged. If God himſelf is pleas'd that his own Laws ſhall ſubmit to thoſe of Neceſſity, much more the Canons of the Church ſhall. Wiſe Men have ſo determin'd, even in this particular caſe. *Gregory* declared that *Auſtin* (notwithſtanding the Canons) might himſelf alone Conſecrate Biſhops, & *quidem in Anglorum Eccleſia, in qua ſolus tu Epiſcopus inveniris, Ordinare Epiſcopum non aliter niſi ſine Epiſcopis potes* *. Doubtleſs, then the meaning of the Canons muſt be, that in Ordinary, and when it may be with convenience three Biſhops are requir'd to the Conſecration of a Biſhop, though even one in the caſe of Neceſſity be

* Bede E. H. l. 1. c. 27. Reſp. 8.

ſufficient.

ſufficient. I will not affirm there was a neceſſity in the caſe of *Pelagius*, (becauſe there was no neceſſity he ſhould be Biſhop of *Rome*) yet after his Conſecration, the wiſe *Italians* might judge it neceſſary to overlook the later Canons, and confirm his Conſecration rather than create an Anti-Pope, and a Schiſm in the Church. *Pelagius* then was a Canonical Biſhop according to the Apoſtolical Canon, though not Canonically Ordained according to the ſtrictneſs of the *Nicene* Canon.

But it will be demanded why did not *Pelagius* content himſelf with two Biſhops, but took in a Presbyter to aſſiſt in the Ordination? The reaſon is plain, becauſe *Pelagius* being a wiſe Man, (as is to be preſumed) though not ſo good as were to be wiſhed, would give his Adverſaries as little occaſion as was poſſible to quarrel at his Ordination. If therefore he could not get three Biſhops, he at leaſt procured two, and a third Perſon, and ſo came as near to the *Nicene* Canon as he could. He obſerved the number, though not the exact Qualification of the Ordainers, and ſo vary'd as little from the Rule, as might be. Hereby he made account to impoſe upon the ignorant Multitude, who 'tis likely were the principal Spectators of the Solemnity of his Ordination: For the Clergy would not be preſent to countenance *his* Ordination, whom they hated.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Waldenſes, *the* Boyarians, *the* Lollards, *and ſome other People, who ſeparated themſelves from the* Roman *Communion.*

OF the *Waldenſes* Mr. *O.* ſpeaks in his Preface, *page* 1. &c. and in the *Plea p.* 156, to the effect following. — " That the *Vaudois*, or *Waldenſes* have " had no other (*Miniſters*) for near 500 Years paſt, than Presbyters Ordained by " Presbyters without Biſhops; that they maintain all Miniſters to be in a ſtate " of Parity; that their Presbyters impoſed Hands for Ordination; that the " *Fratres Bohemi* had their Succeſſion of Miniſters from theſe *Waldenſes*. And for the truth of all this, he quotes *Perrin's* Hiſtory of the *Waldenſes*.

Of what Authority *Perrin* is, may be hence gueſſed, that the Synod, which ſet him on work, diſapproved it, as I am told; or whether Mr. *O.* has given us an honeſt and fair Account of him, I know not. I am a Stranger to that Author, nor can I hereabouts light on him, neither am I very much concerned about any thing he ſays; which is ſo late, *ſc.* according to Mr. *O's* Computation, near 1200 Years after Chriſt, and ſo obſcure, that no weight can be laid upon the Argument drawn from the Practice of theſe *Waldenſes*; I ſay obſcure. For they being a poor and illiterate, thin, ſcatter'd and haraſſed People, and almoſt always under Perſecution, it is Morally impoſſible they ſhould have an exact Hiſtory of themſelves tranſmitted unto theſe laſt Ages, eſpecially, conſidering that their Enemies the Papiſts, made it their buſineſs to deſtroy the moſt an-

cient Records of that People, and as Sir *S. Morland* teſtifies, * the moſt that is known of them, is ſuppoſed generally to be taken out of their Adverſaries Writings, who will ſometimes make bold to load thoſe, who ſeparate from them, with Calumnies, and faſten on them odd Opinions, merely to expoſe and render them the more odious. *Laſtly*, although I do not delight to detract from their Merits, yet I ſee no great reaſon for thoſe exceſſive Commendations ſome think fit to beſtow on them, when I call to mind, that at the time when the *Prince Elector* became firſt acquainted with them, they found the *Waldenſes* taking the Liberty of going to Maſs, and joyning with the Papiſts in their Idolatrous Worſhip. *

Nevertheleſs, theſe Exceptions ſet apart, what I find in ſuch Authors as are at hand ſhall here be produced to confront the others cited by Mr. *O.* to the end the Reader may judge, whether Mr. *O.* and his Author *Perrin* have made a faithful Report of the *Waldenſian* Churches, at leaſt, whether it may not truly be affirmed, that the Hiſtory of that People is ſo uncertain, that no Argument can thence be drawn to countenance the Presbyterian Government, and Ordination by meer Presbyters.

Sir *Sam. Morland* in his Hiſtory of the *Waldenſes*, ſhews * that *Claudius*, Archbiſhop of *Turin*, was a great Promoter of true Doctrine againſt *Roman* Idolatry in his Dioceſs, that the *Waldenſes* ſucceeded this Archbiſhop, † that the ſaid Archbiſhop delivered his Doctrine to his Diſciples, and theſe unto their Succeſſors unto the ninth and tenth Centuries §. In the Year 1059, the *Waldenſes* again ſeparated from *Rome* ¶.

In the Year 1223, the *Albigenſes* in *Bulgaria*, *Croatia* and *Dalmatia*, had one *Bartholomew*, whom they ſtiled their Pope. The Pope's Legate called him Biſhop, *Mat. Paris*, Anti-Pope, adding, that he drew over to him Biſhops, and others, and that he Ordained Biſhops *.

In the Year 1254, *Reinerius* makes mention of their Biſhops in *Lombardy*.

In the Year 1470, the *Waldenſes* in *Moravia* and *Auſtria*, had Biſhops †. They aſſerted that they had Lawfully Ordained Biſhops among them, and an uninterrupted Succeſſion of that Order, even from the Apoſtles, although out of hatred to the Papiſts, they choſe to call them *Seniores* and *Antiſtites*.

In their *Reſponſio Excuſatoria* † *Anno* 1500. they declare, *Nec ſummum Pontificem Romanum, nec alium, nec quempiam alium caput eſſe Eccleſiæ*, plainly intimating, that they had Biſhops among them, as well as the *Romaniſts*.

Anno 1655. *Leger* was Moderator of the Churches of the Valleys, which Office was for Life, with power to call Synods to preſide in them, and to lay on Hands.

Thus much is delivered as Matter of Fact; let us now ſee what were their Principles concerning Church-Government. *Walſas* † ſaith, They held there were but three Degrees of Church-Officers, *ſc.* Biſhops, Prieſts, (*Sacerdotes*) and Deacons; the ſame is delivered

* Hiſt. Wal. l. 1. p. 8.

* Com. p. 24.

* Morland, lib. 1. p. 10.

† Id. p. 11.

§ Morl. Introd.

¶ Allix. Hiſtory of the Churches of Piedmont. p. 238.

* M. Par. 317. Bib. Pat. Tom. 4. pt. 2. p. 752.

† Com. H. W. Pref. ad Rat. Diſcip. &c.

† Faſcic. rerum expetendarum.

Allix p. 243.

† Lud. p. 380.

by

by *Guido*. But *Æneas Sylvius* † — that a Biſhop is not Superior to a Presbyter, either in Dignity, or in Power, as *Alphonſus de Caſtro* alſo obſerved *; and moſt of the Popiſh Writers charge them with that Opinion. But one of them, *viz. Reinerius* does ſet forth their Doctrine and Practice to the effect following. — " The *Cathari*, (or *Puritans*, meaning the *Waldenſes*) " have four Eccleſiaſtical Orders, *viz.* the Biſhop, the elder Son, the younger " Son, (*ſomething like the* Chorepiſcopus, *or Suffragan Biſhop*) and the Deacon. " The Office of the Biſhop is always *tenere Prioratum*, to poſſeſs the Supremacy " in every thing done, in the Impoſition of Hands, in Celebrating the Lord's-" Supper, and in beginning the Prayers, as does the elder Son in the Biſhop's " abſence. The ſaid Orders are created by the Biſhop, or by the Sons with the " Biſhops Licence. When the Biſhop is dead, the younger Son Ordains the " elder a Biſhop; then the Biſhop Ordains the younger Son to be the elder; " and laſtly, another younger Son is choſen by (*Prelatis & Subditis*) the " Miniſters and People, and Ordain'd. But by another part of theſe *Cathari*, " near the Sea, thus, — The Biſhop before his death Ordains the elder Son Bi-" ſhop, (to ſucceed him) and then as before. All the aforeſaid Ordinations are " made with Impoſition of Hands, and the Honour of Ordaining, and giving " the Holy Ghoſt, is attributed unto the Biſhop, or unto him " that is the elder Son, who holdeth the Book of the New-Teſtament " upon the Head of him on whom the hands are laid. Thus much their Adverſaries ſaid of them, wherein, doubtleſs, there is a mixture of Truth and Falſhood; at leaſt this miſerable People ſcattered up and down, did ſomewhat vary in their Rites, and were never at all times and in all places ſteady to themſelves.

† C. 35. p. 14.
* *Adv. Hær.* l. 11. p. 337.
Reinerus Bib. Pat. Tom. 4. Part. 2 p. 758.

I have mentioned before, how that about the Year 1470. the *Waldenſes* in *Auſtria* and *Moravia* had Biſhops; and from theſe it was that the *Fratres Bohemi* drew the Succeſſion of their Eccleſiaſtical Orders; which Hiſtory will deſerve here to be more particularly Tranſcribed. In order whereunto, I muſt now tell the Story of the *Fratres Bohemi* as *Comenius*, and the Hiſtory of the Perſecut. *Bohem.* have made it ready to my Hands, fetching it from the very beginning of Chriſtianity. " The *Sclavonian Nations* were Converted in the Apoſtles times. " *Rom.* 15. 19. 2 Ep. to *Tim.* 4. 10. By *Sclavonians*, *Comenius* " means all the Nations from *Macedonia* Northward, even to " *Ruſſia*, *Polonia* and *Germany*. Some proof of their early em-" bracing the Goſpel, he fetches from St. *Jerom*, who was Born " at *Stridon*, a City of *Illyricum*, or *Dalmatia*.

Com. p. 4.
P. 5.

" In the ſixth Synod of *Conſtantinople*, in the Year 680. the *Lombards* and *Sclavonians*, are acknowledged to be Chriſtians: About the Year " 861. *Cyrillus* and *Methodius*, two *Grecian* Biſhops, made the " People inhabiting about the *Danube*, Chriſtians, and then " paſſing into *Moravia* and *Bohemia*, propagated the Faith a-" mong them †. After this, *Comenius* mentions *Ditmarus Saxo*, " Biſhop of *Prague* *. The Hiſtory of the *Bohemian* Perſecution " tells of *Woyticchius* II. Biſhop of *Prague*, in the Year 907. of " *Boleſlaus Pius*, another Biſhop of *Prague*, *Anno* 965. of Prieſts " and Prelates, *Anno* 1197. who oppoſed the Uſurpations of the " Popes, and of *Conrade*, Biſhop of *Prague*, who leaving the

Id. ibid.
† *Hiſt. Bohem. Perſec.* c. 1. p. 1.
P. 7.
C. 4. p. 9.
C. 5. p. 11.
P. 35, 36.

Romiſh

“ *Romiſh* Errors, remained Biſhop there *Anno* 1421. About 20 Years before
“ this hap'ned, *viz. Anno* 1400. the *Bohemian* Churches ſeparated from the *Roman*,
“ upon the account that the Publick Prayers were made in the Latin Tongue,
“ that the Clergy were obliged to Celibacy, that Tranſubſtantiation was made an
“ Article of Faith, and that the People were deprived of the Cup in the Lord's-
“ Supper. This occaſioned the diſperſion of the *Bohemians*, and their Settlement
“ in *Auſtria*, from whence they ſent unto the *Greek* Church for the Ordination of
“ their Miniſters, and had hopes given them of their obtaining
“ it. They removed after into *Sileſia*. †Com. p. 15.
“ Now it was that *Gregory*, an Holy Man, was by the Perſe- P. 20.
“ cutors tortured ; but falling into a Trance, felt no pain, and
“ was believed , dead. Recovering, he told his Friends of a Viſion, wherein,
“ among other things, he ſaw three Men ſtanding about a Tree laden with
“ Fruit, and defending it from the Birds †; and about the
“ ſame time the *Fratres Bohemi* were under ſome trouble of † P. 21.
“ Mind how they ſhould for the future be provided with a Suc-
“ ceſſion of rightly Ordained Miniſters. For they conſidered that (though ſe-
“ veral of the *Roman* Prieſts came over to them) it was too uncertain to hope for
“ them from *Rome*. They doubted alſo, whether the Ordination was valid,
“ when a Presbyter, and not a Biſhop, Ordained a Presbyter, and that if the
“ Queſtion was once mov'd about it, whether they ſhould be able to defend ſuch
“ an Ordination, either at Home or Abroad. At length, after ſome Years de-
“ liberation, *viz* 1467. and about 6 Years after the ſaid Viſion of *Gregory*, ha-
“ ving Faſted and Pray'd for Direction from God, they reſolved upon the fol-
“ lowing Courſe. They choſe nine of the moſt deſerving Brethren, and fitteſt
“ for the Miniſtry : They wrap up twelve Tickets, nine whereof were Blanks,
“ and three full ones, having writ on them — *eſt*, that is to ſay, as they meant
“ it ſhould ſignifie — *it is the Will of God* ; but the Blanks were to denote it was
“ not the Will of God they ſhould have Biſhops. Theſe twelve Tickets being
“ mixed, were delivered to a young Boy, (not knowing what he did) to be di-
“ ſtributed one to every one of thoſe nine Perſons. 'Tis manifeſt that the nine
“ Blank Tickets might every one have been given out unto theſe nine Perſons;
“ from whence it would have been concluded, that what they were about to do,
“ was not the Will of God. But it ſo hap'ned that the three full Tickets were
“ delivered to three of the nine, *ſc.* to *Kunwaldius*, *Prelaucius*, and *Creneviws*.
“ And hence they gathered aſſuredly, that what they were deſigning, was the
“ Will of God, *ſc.* to ſeek for Epiſcopal Orders, and the means of continuing a
“ right Succeſſion of them, and that to that end thoſe three Perſons were to be
“ Ordained Biſhops. Accordingly they ſent three Perſons unto the Church of
“ the *Waldenſes*, who were at that time planted in the Confines of *Moravia* and
“ *Auſtria*, acquainting them with what was done, and asking their Advice.
“ One of theſe three was *Michael Zambergius* , ſo called, becauſe he was Paſtor
“ *Zambergenſis* †, his true Name being *Michael Bradacius*. How it
“ came to paſs that he was ſent in the room of one of the other †Com. p. 20.
“ three choſen by lot, is not ſaid *. But *Zambergius*, and the * *It may be*
“ other two, coming to the *Waldenſes*, find one *Stephen* their Bi- *one died in the*
“ ſhop, who calling to him another *Waldenſian* Biſhop, and ſome *mean time.*
“ Miniſters, they create theſe three Biſhops with impoſition of “Hands

"Hands, thereby conferring on them the Power of Ordaining "Miniſters *. Theſe three new Ordained Biſhops of the "*Fratres Bohemi* were the three which *Gregory* ſaw in his Viſion, Guardians of the Tree, that is, of the *Bohemian* "Churches. Note that the *Waldenſes* affirmed themſelves to "have had a lawful and uninterrupted Succeſſion of Biſhops "from the Apoſtles days †, and derived their Original from "the time of *Conſtantine*. This happen'd I reckon, about 1420, "or 1430. About the Year 1500, my Author witneſſeth that "there were 200 Churches in *Bohemia* and *Moravia*.

* Com. p. 23, 24, 25. & Boh. Perſ. p. 59, 60.

† Com. Præf. ad Rat. Diſc. Hiſ. Boh. Perſ. ubi ſupra.

"In the Hiſtory of the *Bohemian* Perſecution, after their having received Bi- "ſhops from the *Waldenſes*, I read of *Lucas Pragenſis*, Biſhop of the "*Bohemians* *, of *Sanluceriuſis*, an *Italian* Biſhop, who for Con- "ſcience ſake embraced the *Bohemian* Communion *Anno* 1482, † "and of *Philip*, Biſhop of *Sidon*, being among them *Anno* 1493. "Afterwards in the Year 1499, the *Bohemians* ſent as far as *Ar-* "*menia* for Ordination §, their *Succeſſion perhaps by ſome accident* "*failing*. *Anno* 1542, I find *Joannes Augusta*, was their *Antiſtes*, "or Biſhop.

* P. 79.

† P. 81.

§ P. 82. Com. p. 33, 36.

"The next year after, [illegible] with a great number of the "*Bohemians* retired into *Pruſſia*, whom their Biſhop *Mathias Sio-* "*nius* followed ſoon after.

Id. p. 38.

"About 1556, a Synod was held in the middle of *Moravia*, "where were preſent more than 200 of the Clergy. Then "were fifteen Miniſters Ordain'd, two Biſhops, and ſix Con- "ſeniors. The two Biſhops were *George Iſrael* for the *Polonian* Churches, and "*Johannes Blahoſlaus* for the *Moravian*. At the ſame time *Jo-* "*annes Magnus*, was Biſhop in *Bohemia*.

P. 40.

Id. ubi ſupra.

"Now it was that the *Arians* (afterwards called *Socinians*) "diſturbed the Peace, Order and Unity of the *Fratres Bohemi*, aſſerting that "the Paſtors (*alias*, the Miniſters, or Presbyters) had power to do all things in "the Church. And this Paradox they pretended to advance, leſt any thing "that ſmelt of Popery ſhould remain among them, who had renounced that "Communion §. Therefore they were ſo true to their Princi- "ple, as not only to diſallow of Biſhops, (called Seniors, or "Superintendants) but to deny even the Godhead of Jeſus "Chriſt, becauſe forſooth, the Papiſts maintain'd that Doctrine: But for the ſame "reaſon they might as well have denyed the Being of God himſelf.

§ P. 44.

"At the ſame time, in leſſer *Polonia*, the *Fratres Bohemi* had five Biſhops for "ſo many Dioceſſes, *viz.* the *Cracovian*, the *Sandomirienſis*, the "*Lublinenſis*, the *Ruſſian*, and the *Belſenſis* Dioceſs †.

† P. 46.

"*Anno* 1571. *Joannes Calephus*, was their Biſhop in *Bohemia*, "*Joannes Lavrentius*, in *Poland*, *Stanſlaus* and *Andreas Dyſtimus*, "Biſhops of the *Fratres* in *Bohemia*. And laſtly, *Johannes Amos* "*Comenius* a *Moravian*, and another, a *Polonian*, their Elect "Biſhops, *Anno* 1632. ¶

P. 48, 49, 51.

¶ Com. Ded. Ang. p. 8, 9.

Comenius after this Hiſtory, (of which I have given a Summary Account ſo far as belongs to the preſent Argument) has furniſhed us with another

nother Tractate, which he ſtiles — *Ratio Diſciplinæ Ordiniſq; Eccleſiaſtici in Unitate fratrum Bohemorum.* The Pontifical of the *Bohemian* Brethren, as I may call it, the ſubſtance whereof is as follows. — He tells us, "That in their Church " whereof himſelf was a Biſhop Elect, there were four Orders of Miniſters, *ſc.* " the *Seniores ſeu Antiſtites,* or the *Præpoſiti Miniſtrorum,* ſometimes called *Vigiles,* or " *Speculatores, Superintendentes,* or *Superattendentes,* that is as he explains him- " ſelf in our Language Biſhops. 2 *Conſeniores,* which he expounds *Coepiſcopi,* or " *Chorepiſcopi,* or the Biſhops Fellows. 3. Paſtors, who were alſo Ordinarily " called Miniſters, the ſame as with us are ſtiled Presbyters, Prieſts or Elders. " 4. Deacons called *Paſtorum Adminiſtratores,* or *Adjutores.* Among the Biſhops " there were beſides a *Præſes,* or Primate, or the firſt Biſhop.

" The Preſident's, or Primate's Office, among other things, was to ap- " point and call Synods.

" The Office of the Biſhops, beſides other things, was to Ordain all Eccle- " ſiaſtical Degrees, as Deacons, Paſtors Conſeniors and Seniors, (or Biſhops). " All other Degrees were obedient and ſubject to the Biſhops.

" The Conſeniors were Coadjutors to the Seniors, (or Biſhops), had power " with the Seniors (or without them, but by their Direction and Command) to " be Members of the Eccleſiaſtical Senate, and were above the Paſtors or Dea- " cons. Their buſineſs was to provide for good Order, to acquaint the Se- " niors with Miſdemeanors, to admoniſh the Miniſters, to obſerve the Eccleſiaſti- " cal Statutes and Cuſtomes, to provide fit Perſons for the Miniſtry, to exer- " ciſe Diſcipline over the Miniſters, together with the Biſhops, " or without them, yet by their Direction, to examine the Can- " didates for Holy Orders, and to preſent them to the Biſhops, " diligently to obſerve how the Paſtors diſcharged themſelves " in their Office, to reprove their ſmaller Offences, and to ac- " quaint the Biſhop with their more Scandalous ones. I do " not find they had power to Ordain, and *Comenius* in his Annotations, ſays, " That in *quorundam negotiis Epiſcopi vices obirent,* as the ancient *Chorepiſcopi* did. " If they be choſen Seniors, they are new Ordained with Impoſition of Hands, " as Paſtors, or Miniſters are.

These Conſeniors very much reſemble our Arch-deacons.

" The Seniors Ordain all Orders. The Seniors are choſen by the Seniors, " Conſeniors and Paſtors, and are Ordained in a General Aſſembly, with Impo- " ſition of Hands. At the Solemnity is ſung that Hymn, — *come Holy Ghoſt,* " &c. The former, or the Ordaining Seniors, offer the new created Biſhop " their right Hands in token of Fellowſhip. The Conſeniors theirs in token " of Obedience.

" The Conſeniors being Ordained with Impoſition of Hands give their right " Hands to the Seniors, in token of Obedience, to the former Conſeniors, in to- " ken of Fellowſhip. The Miniſters offer theirs to the new created Conſeni- " ors in token of Obedience.

" Miniſters are Ordained by the Seniors, with laying on of Hands of the " Seniors, ſo many as are preſent. At the Solemnity they ſing that Hymn, " — *come Holy Ghoſt,* &c. The new Ordained Miniſters give their right Hands " unto the Seniors and Conſeniors in token of Obedience, to the Paſtors in to- " ken of Fellowſhip, and the Deacons offer their Hands to them in token of " Obſervance.

To conclude, it must be confeſſed, that *Comenius* ſays Biſhop and Presbyter are one, (I ſuppoſe he means have the ſame Power and Authority to *Miniſter in the Word and Sacraments*, and this is out of all doubt); but withal he intimates that a Biſhop is one, who is moreover, an Inſpector, or Superintendent, and for this cites *Acts* 20. 28. His mind is (I ſuppoſe) that St. *Paul* in the 17th *verſe*, addreſſed himſelf generally to all Presbyters, whether meer Elders or thoſe who moreover had the overſight of the reſt. But in the 28th *verſe* he turns his Speech unto thoſe, eſpecially, who had been made Biſhops. And this is but what the *Syriac* Verſion ſeems to imply, wherein (as has already been noted) *verſe* the 17th Elders is rendered by *Keſiſhaa*, which properly, and only ſignifies *Elders*; but *verſe* the 28th *Episkopos* is uſed, which denotes Overſeers. However this be, if any one carefully obſerves, what has been before related concerning the Government of the Church of the *Bohemians*, it is impoſſible to conceive but that Biſhops (or Seniors) were ſomewhat more than meer Presbyters. The Diviſion of Eccleſiaſtical Officers into three or four Orders, the Power of Ordaining appropriated to Biſhops, the great care they had about getting a right Succeſſion of Orders by Biſhops, and many other remarkable paſſages before mentioned, render this point uncontestable.

From the whole, I think it follows, that the *Waldenſes*, and the *Fratres Bohemi* were governed by Biſhops ſuperior to Miniſters, or Paſtors, long after they were ſeparated from the *Roman* Idolatrous Communion; yea that the *Waldenſes* had Biſhops within 450 Years, and leſs, the *Fratres Bohemi* within 160, that therefore Mr. *O.* is utterly miſtaken, who avers that *the* Waldenſes *had no other Miniſters than Presbyters for near 500 Years laſt paſt, and that Presbyters Ordained Presbyters without Biſhops.* The contrary is moſt certain, if my Authors have not deceived me. Mr. *O.* was not inſenſible of this Matter of Fact, of the *Bohemians* deriving their Biſhops from the *Waldenſes*, but he ſhuffles us off with ſaying, That *the* Waldenſian *Biſhops were only Titular Biſhops* †, That is indeed meer Presbyters honoured with the bare Title of Biſhops. If Mr. *O.* had not known that remarkable Story about *Zamberginus*, and two others, being Ordained Biſhops by *Stephen* and another *Waldenſian* Biſhop, he might poſſible have been pardonable in ſome meaſure for this his raſh and groundleſs Aſſertion: But ſeeing he has thus against Knowledge, and wilfully perverted the manifeſt Truth, by a gloſs of his own making, without any ground, how any one ſhould excuſe him I can't tell, and whether he will be able to defend himſelf, I much queſtion. In the mean while I'll endeavour to demonſtrate that what he has laid down concerning the *Waldenſian* Biſhops, as if they were ſuch in Title only, is a ſenſeleſs Surmize, altogether falſe, and no manner of way reconcileable with the Faith of Hiſtory. For let us but run over the Story once more very briefly, and the truth will appear bright as the Sun at Noon-day. Let it be rembered then, that the *Bohemians* after their Separation from the Church of *Rome*, were a good while ſupplied from thence with Biſhops and Presbyters, who forſaking the *Romiſh* Communion joyned themſelves to that of the Reformed *Bohemians*, and by conſequence had been Epiſcopally Ordained. But the *Bohemians* conſidering with themſelves that it was a very uncertain thing to depend upon ſuch a caſual way of having rightly Ordained Miniſters, and very much doubting, whether Ordination by Presbyters alone, was good and valid, after much deliberation among themſelves, Solemnly

† P. 157.

demnly ask'd Counſel of God by Prayer and Faſting upon that Queſtion; Now, if they believed a Presbyter could validly Ordain Presbyters, there had been no need for any thing of this kind: Why ſhould they be deliberating from time to time near Six Years about having Epiſcopal Orders, and that in a true Succeſſion? If a Presbyter having the bare Title of Biſhop was ſufficient to Ordain, there had been no need to have ſent *Zambergius* unto the *Waldenſes*: It had been but affirming that Biſhop and Presbyter is all one, and that the one has Power to Ordain, as well as the other. Why all this Faſting and Praying, and ſeeking direction from God about a thing of nothing, a Name and Title? What was this but to abuſe themſelves and the World, and to mock God alſo with Pretences unto Religion and Tenderneſs of Conſcience, when 'twas nothing but meer Hypocriſie. Let it be farther conſidered, what a device they formed about reſolving themſelves concerning the Will of God, whether they ſhould ſeek for a Right Succeſſion of Biſhops for the continuance of Holy Orders among them. Is it likely they would have us'd ſo much Precaution againſt any fraud in the delivery of the Lots and in the Deſignation of the Perſons? And all this only that they might have a true Succeſſion of the Title of Biſhop, when they had the Power before. *Zambergius* at leaſt was a Paſtor (or Miniſter or Presbyter) before he was created Biſhop by *Stephen*: Could not he have Ordained Presbyters as many as there was need of, and ſo tranſmitted the Succeſſion of Holy Orders unto future Generations? I am perſwaded if any one ſhould preſume to ſay that *Matthias* was only a Titular Apoſtle but indeed no more than a Diſciple, Mr. *O.* would be ready to rebuke ſo unwarrantable a Conceit. Can any one imagine the Apoſtles would have put the Multitude upon chuſing one into the place of *Judas*, telling them it was neceſſary his Biſhoprick ſhould be filled by another, and becauſe they choſe two that they ſhould by prayer and caſting of Lots decide, which of the Competitors ſhould ſucceed and be declar'd Apoſtle? And after all this Apoſtle was nothing but a Word, a Title, was not different from Diſciple. The *fratres Bohemi* were but in a low and Poor Perſecuted Condition. They had no need to have been at the pains and Charge of Three Perſons, and perhaps more taking a long and dangerous and expenſive Journey unto the *Waldenſes*; and all for an empty and unneceſſary Title of Honour, and which they might have as well aſſumed unto themſelves as the *Waldenſes* had done before 'em according to Mr. *O.*

Well, but perhaps Mr. *O.* has not ſo good an Opinion of the *Bohemians* as he has of the *Waldenſes*. "The *Bohemians* perhaps were fond of Biſhops, and de-"ſirous of a right Succeſſion; and ſome of the dregs of *Roman* Superſtition yet re-"main'd among them: But the *Waldenſes* were nothing ſo: Their Titular "Biſhops were nothing but Presbyters under another Name.

Neither will this do Mr. *O's.* Work: For the *Bohemians* declared to the *Waldenſes* all that had paſt among them, their Scruples about Presbyterian Ordination, and a true Succeſſion of Orders, the way they took to know the Mind of God. The *Waldenſes* approved of all they had done, aſſur'd the *Bohemians* that the Succeſſion of Biſhops among them was from the Apoſtles: And ſo *Stephen* and his Collegues Ordained Three *Bohemian* Biſhops. Can theſe Good Men the *Waldenſes* be excuſed in all this, if Biſhop was but a Word, a Title ſignifying no more than Presbyter? They ſhould rather have told them (as Mr. *O.* has aſſured us), that theres no difference between Biſhop and Presbyter, that among them Presbyters Ordain Presbyters, though under another Title. That the

Bohemians

Bohemians were miſtaken, and that it was a Rag of Popery ſtill cleaving to 'em, to Advance an Order of Biſhops above Presbyters, unto whom the Power of Ordaining belong'd. The *Waldenſes* ought plainly to have thus undeceived the *Bohemians*, and let them know their Error about the Neceſſity of Biſhops. They ought not to have aſſured 'em that they had a Succeſſion of Biſhops from the Apoſtles, and hoiſtered them up in their Error by creating Biſhops. If the *Waldenſes* play'd the *Bohemians* this Trick, I cannot eſteem 'em what Mr. *O.* would have us believe 'em Presbyterian Saints, but as rank Hypocrites as I ever read of. For no Man can excuſe the *Waldenſes*, except by allowing 'em to have been of this perſwaſion, that a Presbyter can't Ordain a Presbyter, and that Orders and the Succeſſion, of the Power of Ordaining muſt paſs through Biſhops not Titular, but really diſtinguiſh'd from Presbyters and Superior to them: Nor were the Biſhops and Miniſters all one, except in Title. How then came the Miniſters by joining Hands at their Ordination, to promiſe Canonical Obedience unto the Biſhops? Laſtly let it be conſidered, that the whole Rationale of the *Bohemian* Hierarchy, was in all probability taken from the *Waldenſes*, from whom their Epiſcopacy was derived. Beſides, if *Stephen* was by Title only a Biſhop, but really a Presbyter and no more, how could the *Bohemians* be able hereby to defend their Orders and the Succeſſion of them againſt their Adverſaries abroad (meaning I believe the Papiſts), when as indeed their Ordinations were meerly Presbyterian, though in Title Epiſcopal? And what ſorry comfort was this to the *Bohemians*, that the Three Titular Biſhops being returned to their own People could only Acquaint 'em, that they had indeed been Ordain'd by two Titular Biſhops, who nevertheleſs were but Presbyters ſuch as they themſelves were before, and to tell you the truth, we have deliberated long upon this buſineſs, we have prayed and faſted in vain, and God by anſwering our ſign in the Affirmative has but at laſt deceived us. We have taken a long and chargeable Journey to the *Waldenſes*, but have brought no thing back worthy our pains, but a Word and Empty Title. Thus the whole Action was meer Pageantry, a Scene of Impoſture, and an Intrigue carried on by Hypocrites on both ſides: This muſt be confeſſed, if the *Waldenſian* Biſhops were meerly Titular (as Mr. *O.* is pleaſed to ſay). On the other Hand the Hiſtory aſſures us, that the *fratres Bohemi* were exceedingly comforted and encouraged at the return of their Presbyters now created Biſhops and deriving their Orders in an uninterrupted Succeſſion from the *Apoſtles*, as they believ'd. But at length my Adverſary ſeems to halt a little and to come half way over to us. He profeſſes thus in his own and Brethren's Name—"We "diſlike not that for Orders ſake the Exerciſe of this Power ſhould be Ordinarily "reſtrained to the Graver Miniſters, provided they aſſume it not as proper to "them by Divine Right, nor clog it with unſcriptural Impoſitions." From this Conceſſion of Mr. *O.* it follows—1. That in Mr. *O's* Judgment the Church may reſtrain the Power of Ordaining, taking the Exerciſe of it from ſome of the Younger Fry, and lodging it in the Hands of the Graver ſort. But the miſchief is, the Younger ſort will preſently cry out againſt the Uſurpation, they will plead, "That they are Presbyters as well as others, and have an Inherent "Power to Ordain, that can't be taken from them by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions; "that they can't in Conſcience part with that Power and Right, which the Scri-"pture gives them." And in ſhort will turn all Mr. *O's* Battering Rams againſt the Graver Miniſters, which he has planted againſt our Biſhops, and with more

Reaſon

Reaſon too. For St. *Paul* when he reſtrained the Power of Ordination, he had not reſpect to Age, but to Ability. *Timothy* was but a Young Man, when *Paul* ſet him over the Church of *Epheſus*, and I have reaſon to think *Titus* was ſo too: For he admoniſhes him to take care that *no Man deſpiſe him*, c. 2. 15. where I ſuppoſe it is to be underſtood that *Titus* alſo was but young. And *Demas* Biſhop of *Magneſia*, in *Ignatius* was a Young Man alſo, &c. If Mr. *O.* would be pleaſed to give me leave to ſuppoſe St. *Paul* as Wiſe as himſelf, 'tis all I aſk. I will ſuppoſe then, that the ſaid Apoſtle for Orders ſake did reſtrain the exerciſe of the Ordaining Power to ſome Perſons by Him made Choice of, and for the prevention of Schiſm did preſcribe the ſame Rule unto the Churches, which Mr. *O.* ſees ſome reaſon for now doubtleſs then St. *Paul* left not the Power of Ordaining promiſcuouſly unto all Presbyters, but limited it unto a few, I will not ſay the Graver or Older ſort, but the Wiſer and moſt Holy. If Mr. *O.* would nouriſh this Principle, and make ſuch Deductions from it as 'tis capable of, he would ſoon ſee that Epiſcopal Ordination is Apoſtolical. But I believe his own Party will conn him no Thanks for this Liberal Conceſſion. Mr. *O.* adds—*and not clog it with unſcriptural Impoſitions.* If there be any Order in a Church ſome few things muſt of neceſſity be impoſed: But this is what the Diſſenters aim at, that every one may be left at Liberty to ſay and do what is right in his own Eyes. The Impoſitions laid upon the Ordained among us are not ſuch as the Biſhops themſelves alone deviſed, but the Whole Church conſented unto, and though they be not preſcrib'd in Scripture, they are not Antiſcriptural nor introduc'd into the place of any thing required by the Word of God. In ſhort, did not the Presbyterians when they were in the Saddle clog their Ordinations with unſcriptural Impoſitions? I mean that of taking the Covenant. But this is to carry the Controverſy into another Quarter. I ſhall therefore let it paſs.

Of the Lollards.

Walſingham has, it is confeſt, fathered that Practice on the *Lollards* that their Presbyters after the manner of Biſhops did create new Presbyters, and that every Prieſt (or Presbyter) has as good a Power to bind and looſe, and to Miniſter in all other things belonging to the Church as the Pope himſelf gives or can give. But to this it may be reply'd, that 'tis only the report of an Adverſary, and perhaps may be a Scandal. It may again be anſwered, that theſe *Lollards* came too late to preſcribe unto the Church in any thing by them practiſed. It may yet further be ſaid that, when People grope their way in a Dark Night, it is no wonder if they now and then Stumble. They are to be both pittied and pardoned. For laſtly, 'tis manifeſt (if the Teſtimony of their Adverſaries concerning them be admitted) that the *Lollards* look'd upon even Presbyters as an Order no ways approv'd of by God. It was one of their Maxims— *Presbyteratus non eſt Ordo approbatus a Deo.* So that Presbyters as well as Biſhops are by the ſame Authority utterly proſcrib'd the Church. It was another of their Opinions according to *Walſingham* (p. 366.) that no Day is Holy, not the Lord's-Day (or Sabbath Day as People will call it), but that on every Day

Men

Men may work, eat and drink, &c. If then the *Lollards* erred thus groſly in theſe points, it is no wonder that they were miſtaken in that of the Government of the Church by Biſhops. But if their Authority be ſufficient to eſtabliſh Presbyters in the Power of Ordaining, by the ſame Authority it may be proved the Lords-Day is not Holy. Yea, rather, if the Order of Presbyters be not approved of by God, 'tis in vain for Mr *O.* to equal them unto Biſhops, becauſe the *Lollards* brought them down as low as the People, and utterly Cancelled their Office, at leaſt denyed it to be of Divine Inſtitution. In ſhort, I think they were a well meaning, but ignorant People, who had Wit and Knowledge enough to diſcover the groſs Superſtition, Idolatry and Corruptions of the Romiſh Church; but not to define the true Doctrine of the Goſpel, about Government and Diſcipline. Finally note here, that this Inſtance of the *Lollards* (who appeared at ſooneſt about the end of the 14th Century) is by

P. 126. Mr *O.* brought in proof of this Propoſition, *the Ordination by Presbyters was valid in the Primitive Church.* Now I don't believe that there is one other Author extant, that pretends ſuch Familiar Acquaintance with the Fathers and Councils as Mr. *O.* does, eſpecially not among the Proteſtants, that ever reckoned the Practice of the 14th Century for Primitive. The 4th or 5th Age are the lateſt we are wont to appeal to, at leaſt under the Title of the Primitive Church. But what? all are Fathers with Mr. *O.* that favour his Opinion, and the Primitive Church will never have an end, ſo long as any thing can be found conformable to the Presbyterian Diſcipline.

Concerning the *Boiarians*, or *Bavarians*, who, as Mr. *O.* would have us believe, were once Presbyterians, I will only ſay thus much in ſhort. I find in their Hiſtory written by *Jo. Aventinus* Edit. *Baſil.* 1580. that from the earlieſt times of their embracing Chriſtianity they had Biſhops, and long before they ſubmitted their Necks to the Yoke of the *Roman* Pontifs. I have made ſome Collections and Remarks out of the fore-mentioned Hiſtorian; but will not trouble my ſelf, or Reader with them. He that is curious, and has a mind to ſearch into the Principles and Practice of this People, may take *Aventinus* into his Hands, and ſatisfie himſelf whether ever there was a time when the *Boiarians* were without Biſhops, and governed by Presbyters only. It is not indeed the deſign of this Hiſtory to treat of this Argument directly; but however, as he goes along, he ſtill occaſionally mentions the *Boiarian* Biſhops, even before they were brought into ſubjection to *Rome*.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Doctrine of the Church of England *at and ſince the Reformation.*

P. 112. THIS Controverſy at laſt is brought to our own Doors, and continued down to our own Times: *This Doctrine* (ſays Mr. *O.*) *meaning the Identity of Prieſt and Biſhop) hath*

been

been maintained alſo by the Church of England, *both* Popiſh *and* Proteſtant. Hereunto belong the Teſtimonies which he has in dvers Pages of his *Plea* drawn from the publick Acts of the Church and State, and the particular Sentiments of private Doctors, both of the *Roman* and *Proteſtant* Communion, both of the Eſtabliſhed and Diſſenting Party among us. All I am concerned for, is to conſider whether the Identity of Presbyter and Biſhop has been declared in any publick Act of this Kingdom to be found, or produced by Mr. *O.* out of the National Records, at, or ſince the Reformation. For 'tis nothing to me, if the Popiſh Church of *England* was of the ſame Opinion with our Diſſenters, as perhaps many Papiſts were for advancing the Power and Supremacy of their Pontiff. Nor is it my buſineſs to account for every caſual Expreſſion, that has dropt from the Pen of any Epiſcopal Writer, much leſs of the Diſſenters, whoſe Golden Sayings make up a great part of thoſe numerous Quotations wherewith he hath ſtuft his *Plea.* My deſign is upon Mr. *O.* himſelf, and the Authorities he has gathered out of the publick Tranſactions, or ſuch as were directed and confirmed by the Government. Mr. *O.* has alledged three againſt us; the little Treatiſe, commonly called, *The Biſhops Book*, another, called, *The Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Man*, and a third is that Celebrated *MS.* firſt Publiſhed by Mr. *Stillingfleet*, the late Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*, in his *Irenicum*; all which (as I ſhall prove) belong unto the Reign of *Hen.* VIII. and whatever Opinions are there to be met with, are not to be imputed to our firſt Reformers, at leaſt, not as their fixed and ſettled Judgment; for I reckon, that in *Hen.* VIII's Days, the Reformation was but an *Embryo* in the Womb, newly conceived, not brought forth, that in *Edward* VI.'s time 'twas an Infant new Born, and in its Swadling Cloths, and in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign arrived to the beſt degree of Perfection and Maturity, that it has yet been able to attain unto, during which Queens Government, ſomething alſo is objected to us, which ſhall be examined in its Order.

The *Biſhop's Book*, was an Explanation of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Grounds of Religion, fitted for the Common Peoples Inſtruction. 'Twas compoſed by ſundry Biſhops, of whom, *Cranmer* was chief, by vertue of a Commiſſion iſſued out by *Henry* VIII. in the Year 1537. eſtabliſhed by Parliament, and Printed by *Tho. Barthelet*, with this Title. *The Godly and Pious Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Man.* Out of this Book, *Fox* has furniſhed us with this following Paſſage — * "That there is no mention made, "neither in the Scripture, nor in the Writings of any Authentick Doctor, or Author of the Church, being within the "Times of the Apoſtles, that Chriſt did ever make, or conſtitute any Diſtinction, or Difference to be in the preeminence of Power, Order, or Juriſdiction, between the Apoſtles themſelves, and the Biſhops themſelves, but that they were all equal in power, &c. and that there is now, "and ſince the time of the Apoſtles any ſuch diverſity. It was deviſed by the "ancient Fathers of the Primitive Church for the Conſervation of good Order and Unity in the Catholick Church. From hence Mr. *O.* has gathered (for he refers to *Fox's* Martyrology) *that theſe Biſhops* (the Authors of that Book) *affirm'd the difference of Biſhops and Presbyters was a Device of the Ancient Fathers, and not mentioned in Scripture.*

Strype's Mem A. B. *Cranmer.* l. 1. c. 13. p. 50.

* B. of *Mar.* Vol. 2.

P. 114.

Anſ. This Deduction is downright falſe, and directly againſt the obvious Meaning of the Words. The deſign of that Prince at that time, was to throw off the Pope, and his Juriſdiction *over* the Church and Biſhops of *England*; to this end in the Biſhops Book 'tis affirmed, that as the Apoſtles were *equal among themſelves*, ſo were the Biſhops *equal among themſelves* in the Apoſtolical Times, or (according to *Jerom*) that the Biſhop of *Rome* was not by Divine Right Superior to the Biſhop of *Eugubium*: That therefore as I anon obſerve out of *The King's Book*, Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans, and Archbiſhops, and particularly, the Pope of *Rome* had originally no Preeminence and Authority over other Biſhops, particularly, not over the *Engliſh*; only that it was a voluntary Agreement among themſelvs for Orders ſake: But from the beginning it was not ſo. Here is not one word of Presbyters, or exempting them from Subjection unto Biſhops. Now, that I have not done the leaſt wrong unto this Book, I appeal to what I find elſewhere, taken thence by Mr. *Strype* †. "How that the Church of *England* is in no "Subjection to the Pope, but to the King's Laws: That Prieſts "and Biſhops never had any Authority by the Goſpel, in matters *Civil and Moral*, but by Grant and Gift of Princes, that it was always, and "ever ſhall be Lawful unto Kings and Princes, with the Conſent of their Parliaments, to revoke and call again into their Hands, or otherwiſe, to reſtrain "all the Power and Juriſdiction given, and permitted by their Authority and "Aſſent, and Sufferance, without which, if the Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other "Biſhop whatſoever, ſhould take upon them any Authority, or Juriſdiction in "ſuch matters as be *Civil*, that Biſhop is not worthy the Name, is an Uſurper, "and Subverter of the Kingdom: That the Church of *England* is a Catholick "and Apoſtolick Church, as well as that of *Rome*: That there is no difference in "Superiority, Preeminence, or Authority of one (Biſhop) over another: But they "be all of equal Power and Dignity, and that all Churches be free from the "Subjection and Juriſdiction of the Church of *Rome*. The Equality here ſpoken of in the beginning, and in the latter end of this Period, is not between Biſhops and Presbyters in the ſame Church, but between Biſhop and Biſhop, Church and Church, and particularly, that no Church (that of *England* eſpecially) is ſubject to *Rome*. And though in the beginning he names Prieſts and Biſhops, ſuch Prieſts haply were meant as took upon them to Act here in *England*, in Subordination to, and by the Popes Authority, not a Syllable of the Equality of Biſhops and Prieſts is here to be found; only that both depend upon the Civil Magiſtrate, and that *in Civil and Moral Matters* only.

† *Mem.* p. 53.

P. 113. The ſecond Teſtimony alledged by Mr. *O.* is another (if haply it be another) Book, entituled — *The Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Man*, drawn up by the whole Clergy in a Provincial Synod, *Anno* 1537. ſet forth by the Authority of King *Henry* VIII. and the Parliament, and commanded to be Preached. Out of this Book (afterwards Tranſlated into Latin as I gueſs) Mr. *O.* cites as follows. — *In Novo Teſtamento nulla mentio facta eſt aliorum graduum aut Diſtinctionum in Ordinibus, ſed Diaconorum vel Miniſtrorum & Presbyterorum, ſive Epiſcoporum.* Which Words (it muſt be confeſſed) look pretty fair and favourable towards Mr. *O.* at firſt ſight.

N. Ibid. *Anſ.* In the firſt place, I will here preſent the Reader with what the Author of the Memorials has delivered concerning this,

this, and ſome other Books of the ſame nature, and written with the ſame deſign. The *Biſhops Book*, otherwiſe called *The Godly and Pious Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Man*, of which before, came forth again two Years after, *ſc.* in the Year 1540. but bearing another Name, *viz.* *A neceſſary Doctrine and Erudition for a Chriſtian Man*; Printed alſo by *Barthelet*: That this alſo was once more Publiſhed in *Engliſh*, and dated *Anno* 1543. as at the end of the ſaid Book, according to the Cuſtom of thoſe Times; though at the bottom of the Title Page I find it dated alſo 1534. This was compoſed by *Cranmer*; but called *The King's Book*, becauſe *Hen* VIII. recommended it to the People by Proclamation, added to it by way of Preface, and aſſumed to himſelf the being the Author of it. Mr. *Strype* farther acquaints me that in the Year 1536. had been publiſhed a Book, Entituled *The Biſhops Book*, becauſe framed by them; I gueſs it the ſame with that I firſt ſpoke of, and that it was written by the Biſhops *Anno* 1636. but Printed 1637. and he yet tells us of another, which came forth in the Year 1633. alſo commonly called *The King's Book*, but Entituled, *The Difference between the Kingly and Eccleſiaſtical Power*. I have procured a ſight alſo of a Latin Book, going under this Title. — *Chriſtiani Hominis Inſtitutio Edit.* 1544. in the Preface whereof, 'tis ſaid to have been at firſt writ in *Engliſh*, and then Tranſlated into Latin, by whom, or by what Authority I find not; and whether this be the ſame with Mr. *O's*, I know not; but this is ſure, Mr. *O's* was Printed 1537. as himſelf confeſſes; mine 1544. and the paſſage cited by Mr. *O.* is no where to be read in mine. And ſince nothing like it is to be met with in any of the other Books, and all the Controverſy in thoſe times was between the Pope and the *Engliſh* Biſhops, not about the ſuperiority, or the diſtinction of Biſhops and Presbyters in the ſame Church, I am apt to fear ſome foul play. But concerning the Teſtimony its ſelf, as allowed of, I ſhall ſpeak more by and by.

Mean while let us ſearch for what may be had to the purpoſe in *The King's Book*, Entituled *A neceſſary Doctrine and Erudition of a Chriſtian Man*.

If it ſhall be ſaid, that Mr. *O's* Deduction before ſpoken of, was borrowed not out of the *King's Book*, but the *Biſhops Book*; yet I hope the one will be allowed to explain the other. Thus then I read in the *King's Book*. — "That the Sacrament of Order is a Gift or Grace of Miniſtration in Chriſt's Church, given of God to Chriſtian Men, by the Conſecration and Impoſition of the *Biſhops Hands*. That this Sacrament was conferred, and given at the beginning by the Apoſtles unto Prieſts and Biſhops. That St. *Paul* Ordered and Conſecrated *Timothy* Prieſt; That the Apoſtles appointed and willed *the other Biſhops after them to do the like*, as is manifeſt from *Tit.* 1. 5. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. That there is no certain Rule preſcribed, or limited by the Word of God for the nomination, election, preſentation, or appointing of any ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters, but the ſame is left unto the poſitive Laws and Ordinances of every Chriſtian Region, provided, made, or to be made, &c. — He afterwards enumerates in particular the Common Offices and Miniſtries, both of Prieſts and Biſhops, *ſc.* Teaching, Preaching, Miniſtring the Sacraments, Conſecrating and Offering the Bleſſed Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Altar, looſing and aſſoiling from Sin, Excommunicating and finally, Praying for the whole Church, and their own Flock in ſpecial. — That they may not Exerciſe nor Execute thoſe Offices, but with ſuch "ſort

Par. 1.

Par. 2.

Par. 5. "ſort and ſuch Limitations, as the Laws permit and ſuffer— "That the Apoſtles Ordained Deacons alſo. *Acts*. 6. That of "theſe two Orders only, that is Prieſts and Deacons, Scripture maketh expreſs "mention, and how they were conferred of the Apoſtles by

Par. 6. "Prayer and Impoſition of Hands——That Patriarchs Pri- "mates Archbiſhops and Metropolitans, have not now nor "heretofore at any time had juſtly and lawfully Authority, Power and Juriſdicti- "on over other Biſhops given them by God in Holy Scripture: That all Powers "and Authorities of any one Biſhop over another were, and be given unto them "by the conſent Ordinance and Poſitive Laws of Men only, *&c.*

In the *Chriſtiani hominis Inſtitutio*, which I have ſeen, there is ſome diſagreement to be found: For whereas *the Neceſſary Doctrine and Erudition*, &c. ſeems to ſpeak of *two Orders only, i. e.* Prieſts and Deacons, the *Chriſtiani hominis Inſtitutio*, expreſſeth it thus——*de his tantum Ordinationibus Presbyterorum & Diaconorum, Scriptura expreſſe meminit*, &c. meaning, as I ſuppoſe, not two Ranks and Degrees of Church Officers, but two Ordinations or Conſecrations of Perſons appointed to the Miniſtry, *ſc.* of Presbyters and Deacons: That is, the Conſecration of Presbyters and Deacons, is only expreſly mentioned in Scripture, and that Biſhops received not any New diſtinct Impoſition of Hands: And ſo *Orders* in the *neceſſary Doctrine*, &c. is to be underſtood, as I conceive not of Perſons, but of the Ordination of them as 'tis often uſed unto this Day. It is not then affirm'd in either, that there was in the Church but two Ranks or Degrees of Eccleſiaſtical Offices, that is Prieſts and Deacons, (and not Biſhops) according to the Scripture: But that two Conſecrations only were expreſly mentioned there, nevertheleſs a ſuperiour Rank might be found in the Scripture, tho' not ſeparated thereto by a new Impoſition of Hands. Mr *O*'s quotation ſeems indeed to ſound quite to another Senſe, and to his purpoſe rather, ſc. *that in the New Teſtament no mention is made of other degrees and diſtinctions* (in Ordinibus) *but of Deacons* (or Miniſters) *and of Preſbyters* (or Biſhops) How Miniſters and Biſhops crept in here, I'll not ſay: But they are capable ſtill of the ſame Sence, ſc. *that in the New Teſtament there is no mention of other degrees and Diſtinctions of Perſons in Orders* (*that is of Perſons Ordained by Impoſition of Hands*) *except Deacons and Presbyters*: For Biſhops were not conſecrated again by any expreſs appointment in Scripture according to the prevailing opinion of thoſe times. 'Tis laſtly to be obſerved, that in the *neceſſary doctrine*, &c. that we read, that *Patriarchs, Primates Archbiſhops and Metropolitans, have not now nor ever had Power, Authority and Juriſdiction over other Biſhops given them by God in Scripture*, 'tis in the Latin Tranſlation added *cæteroſq; Inferiores Epiſcopos aut Presbyteros*, which makes no alteration. For who is there that believes not, that the Archbiſhop of *York* has no Juriſdiction over the Biſhop of *Cheſter*, nor over the Presbyters of this Dioceſs, but what is given him by the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Law of the Land, for Peace and Orders ſake? But 'tis worthy our Notice that in the *K*'s *Book* (as is before at large ſet down) Orders or Ordination is taught to be, "A "Divine Gift or Grace given by the Impoſition of the Biſhops Hands: That the "Apoſtles gave this Grace and appointed the Biſhops after them to do the like: What need we any more? Here are Biſhops having the Power of Ordaining diſtinguiſhed from the Ordained, *ſc.* Prieſts and Deacons.

But when all is ſaid, and what ever Senſe any Man ſhall think fit to put upon theſe paſſages out of the King's and Biſhop's Book I make little account of. At

beſt

beſt they expreſs the Mind and Opinion of *Hen.* 8th, *Cranmer* and other Biſhops, who were all ſtill ingag'd and held faſt in the Toils of Popiſh Errors and Superſtitions, all their Deſign hitherto in theſe Books being only to caſt off the Power and Juriſdiction of the Pope. For the Reſt, they continued yet Papiſts all over. *Cranmer* himſelf, who was chiefly imployed in drawing up theſe Books, ſtill retained his old Errors and Prejudices ſuck'd in with his Milk, and continued Zealous for the Corporal Preſence even to the laſt Year of *Hen.* 8th. *In the neceſſary Doctrine publiſh'd* 1543. 'twas taught, *Prefat.* that in the *Ave Mary* the Bleſſed Virgin is Honoured and Worſhipped, that the reading the Old and New Teſtament is not ſo neceſſary, as of Duty the People ought and be bound to read it, but as the Prince and Polity of the Realm ſhall think convenient, that the Publick Law of the Realm had ſo reſtrained it. The ſeven Sacraments are in the Book its ſelf aſſerted and explained, Prayers for the dead recommended upon the Authority of the Book of *Maccabees*, and of the Ancient Doctors in Maſſes and Exequies. Now this is an hopeful Book to eſtabliſh Proteſtant Doctrines by, and thence to affirm, the Proteſtant Church of *England* was of the Mind there were no more Officers in the Church, than Biſhops (or Preſbyters) and Deacons. P. 113. At beſt the Reformation was but now on the Anvil, and *Cranmer* and the other Reformers were but Hammering it out by Degrees. Nor can we believe they always or at that very time declared their own Opinions fully and freely. *Hen.* VIII. was an Haughty and Sturdy Prince impatient of any Oppoſition, and reſolved to aſſume unto himſelf all the Popes Uſurped Powers. *Cranmer* and his Aſſociates thought it a good ſtep towards their Deſign, if they could but ſhake off the Tyranny of the Pope, hoping after this point once gain'd they might in good time compaſs their whole Deſign, and eſtabliſh the Church upon the ſure Foundations of Truth. To pleaſe then the Humour of the King and gratify his Pride, it muſt be declar'd and acknowledged forſooth, by the Biſhops, when they took out their Commiſſions (as *Cranmer* himſelf did more than once) that all Power both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical flowed from the King, that the Biſhops Exerciſed it only by the Kings Courteſie, that the King impowred them to Ordain, to give Inſtitution, and to do all other parts of the Epiſcopal Function, of which Opinion *Cranmer* himſelf was *Anno* 1540, and even in the firſt of *Edward* the 6th, or pretended to be. *Stripes Mem.* l. 2. c. 1. In ſhort, this Character Dr. *Burnet* gives of the Archbiſhop, that *his greateſt weakneſs was his over Obſequiouſneſs to* Hen. VIII. *Burn. Abri.* B. 1. p. 250. *and* p. 4. 5. b. 2. p. 22. There is then no Colour to aſcribe any thing we meet with in theſe Books, as the free and ſettled Judgment of *Cranmer*, much leſs as the Doctrine of the *Engliſh* Proteſtant Church. And if any Man ſhall pretend by theſe Teſtimonies to overthrow the Divine Right of Biſhops, he will be oblig'd to lay aſide the Divine Right of Preſbyters alſo, who were at the ſame time and in the ſame manner ſubjected to the Will of the King and to the Laws of the Land, as any intent Reader may obſerve from the aforeſaid Paſſages out of *the Kings and Biſhops Books.* And ſo much of this matter.

The Third Teſtimony objected againſt us is the Celebrated *MS.* in the *Irenicum*, from whence we are informed. " That *Plea.* p. 113.

" *Cranmer*

" *Cranmer* and other Biſhops ſet forth this to be their judgments, that Biſhops " and Prieſts were one Office in the Beginning of *Chriſt's* Religion alledging " *Jerom* in Confirmation.

Anſ. I have ſaid enough of *Jerom* already, and need not repeat or apply it here. I chuſe 1. to preſent the Reader with ſome particular account of that *MS.* before I directly reply to the Objection. " The King called a Select Convention of Biſhops and Learned " Doctors at *Windſor* Caſtle, who were to give their Reſolutions of ſeveral Queſtions relating to Religion every one under his own Hand. " They did ſo, and *Cranmer's* are particularly recorded in the ſaid *MS.* Thoſe which belong to Our preſent purpoſe are.

' Iren. p.389. 390.

Queſt. 9. Whether the Apoſtles lacking an higher Power, as not having a Chriſtian King among them, made Biſhops by neceſſity or by Authority given them of God.

Anſ. Cranmer. " All Chriſtian Princes have committed to them immediatly " of God the Whole care of all their Subjects concerning the Adminiſtration of " God's Word for the care of Souls. That the Prince has ſundry Miniſters un- " der him as Biſhops, Parſons, Vicars and other Prieſts, who are appointed by his " Highneſs unto that Miniſtration: That the ſaid Officers and Miniſters, as well " of one ſort as of the other be appointed, aſſigned and elected in every place by " the Laws and Orders of Kings and Princes: That in the Apoſtle's time, when " there were no Chriſtian Princes, the Miniſters of Gods Word were appointed " by the conſent of the Chriſtian Multitude among themſelves: That ſometimes " the Apoſtles ſent and appointed Miniſters of God's Word, ſometimes the People " did chuſe them, and thoſe ſent and appointed by the Apoſtles, the People of " their own will accepted, not for the Supremacy or Dominion that the Apoſtles " had over them to Command as their Princes and Maſters, but as good People " ready to obey the advice of good Conſellors.

Queſt. 10. Whether Biſhops or Prieſts were firſt: If Prieſt, then the Prieſt made the Biſhop.

" *Cr. Anſ.* The Biſhops and Prieſts were at one time, and were not two " things, but both one Office in the beginning of Chriſts Religion.

Queſt. 11. Whether a Biſhop has Authority to make a Prieſt by the Scripture or no: And whether any other, but only a Biſhop may make a Prieſt.

Cr. Anſ. " A Biſhop may make a Prieſt by the Scripture, ſo may Princes " and Governours, and the People alſo by Election: The People did commonly " elect their Biſhops and Prieſts.

Queſt. 12. Whether in the New Teſtament be required any Conſecration of a Biſhop and a Prieſt, or only appointing to the Office be ſufficient.

Cr. Anſ. In the New Teſtament, he that is appointed to be a Biſhop or a Prieſt needeth no Conſecration by the Scripture: For Election and appointing thereunto is ſufficient.

I have ſomewhat contracted the Archbiſhops Anſwers, but ſo as to preſerve the Senſe full and intire, and ſomethings I have omitted not Material (as I Judge) here to be ſet down. Theſe Queſtions and Anſwers in the *MS.* were ſubſcrib'd *T. Cant. and this is mine Opinion and Sentence, which I do not temerariouſly define, but remit the Judgment wholly to your Majeſty.*

To

To all which I reply 1. That though theſe were the Opinions of *Cranmer* yet other Biſhops, unto whom the ſame Queſtions were put were otherwiſe perſwaded. Mr. *Strype*, has furniſhed us with different Anſwers given by ſome others of the learned Doctors or Biſhops of that time from another *MS.* out of *Cotton's* Library. *Mem. in Appen. n. 27.*

To the 9th *Queſtion.* " The Calling, Naming, Appointment, and Prefer-
" ment of one before another to be a Biſhop or Prieſt had a neceſſity to be done
" in that ſort, a Prince being wanting: The Ordering (Ordination) appeareth
" taught by the Holy Ghoſt in the Scripture *per manuum Impoſitionem cum Oratione.*
This I doubt not will be own'd a truer and more Scriptural Reſolution of the Queſtion then *Cr's* was.

To *Queſtion* 10th. " *Biſhops* (were firſt) *or not after:* Theſe learned Men ſpake here cautiouſly; *Cranmer* raſhly and roundly pronounces.

To *Queſt.* 11. " Scripture warranteth a Biſhop obeying the Prince to Order
" a Prieſt *per Manuum Impoſitionem cum Oratione*, and ſo it hath been from the
" beginning. They do not boldly define that Prieſt and Biſhop were one Office in the beginning of Chriſt's Religion, as *Cranmer* did.

" To *Queſt.* 12——*Manuum Impoſitio cum Oratione*, is required unto the
" making of a Biſhop or Prieſt: So as only appointing it is not ſufficient.

There is yet the Judgment of other Learned Men to be ſeen in Mr. *Strype*, which I will add unto the former. *Id. ibid.* 28.

To *Queſt.* 9th——" Making Biſhops has two parts, Ap-
" pointment and Ordination. Appointment, which by neceſſity the Apoſtles
" made by Common Election, and ſometime by their own Aſſignment, could not
" be done by Chriſtian Princes, becauſe there were none; yet now appertain-
" eth to them: But in Ordering wherein Grace is conferred, the Apoſtles followed
" the Rule taught by the Holy Ghoſt, *per Manuum Impoſitionem cum Oratione &*
" *Jejunio.* A more ſolid and Judicious Anſwer then *Cranmer's.*

To *Queſt.* 10——" Chriſt made the Apoſtles firſt both Prieſts and Biſhops,
" but whether at one time ſome doubt. After that the Apoſtles made both Bi-
" ſhops and Prieſts, the names whereof in the Scripture be confounded. They manifeſtly imply a real diſtinction between them, in the beginning, though they were one in Name, or rather though both were called by both Names indifferently.

To *Queſt.* 11——" The Biſhop having Authority from his Prince to give Or-
" ders, may by his Miniſtry given to him of God in Scripture
" Ordain a Prieſt, and we read not that any other not being a
" Biſhop hath ſince the beginning of Chriſt's Church Ordained
" a Prieſt. *N. B.* *N. B.*

To *Queſt.* 12——" Only Appointment is not ſufficient, but Conſecration,
" that is to ſay, Impoſition of Hands with faſting, and prayer is alſo required.
" For ſo the Apoſtles uſed to Order them that were appointed, and ſo has been
" uſed continually, and we have not read the contrary.

From the whole it appears, that what ever was *Cranmer's* Opinion, yet others were of a contrary Mind. It cannot then be truly affirm'd, that *Cranmer's* was the Judgment of the Church of *England*, as farther may be confirmed by what Dr. *Leighton* reply'd at the ſame time unto the Queries.

" 1. I

" 1. I ſuppoſe, that a Biſhop has according to the Scripture Power from " God as being his Miniſter to create the Presbyter, although he ought not to " promote any one unto the Office of a Presbyter or admit him to any Eccleſiaſti-" cal Miniſtry, unleſs the Princes leave be firſt obtained in a Chriſtian Common-" Wealth. But that any other Perſon has according to the Scripture Power to " create the Presbyter, I have not read nor learned from any Inſtance. 2. I ſup-" poſe Conſecration by laying on of Hands is neceſſary: For ſo we are taught by " the Examples of the Apoſtles. Thus much Dr. *Durel*, who read the whole MS. by the permiſſion of Mr. *St.* reports out of it in his *Vindiciæ Eccleſiæ Angli.* The Judgment then of *Cranmer* ſet forth in that MS. cannot with any Truth be aſcribed to the Church of *England*; it was the Opinion but of ſome Perſons, from which their Contemporaries we ſee differed much.

Durel. Vinc. Eccl. An. c.28. p. 328.

But, 2. the Argument grounded on the MS. belongs not to the time when the Church of *England* was Proteſtant. So that the Reſolution of thoſe Queries were rather of the Popiſh Church of *England*. For the Queſtions were not put by *Edw.* VI. as was at firſt ſurmized, but by *Hen.* VIII. To make out which note.

1. The Manuſcript has no date, nor any King named in it, that called the Aſ-ſembly at *Windſor*. One may then aſcribe it to the Father *Henry*, as well as to the Son *Edward*.

2. *Cranmer* ſubmits himſelf and his Sentence unto the Judgment of the King. But *Edward* VI. was a Child too young, and unexperienced to aſk theſe Queſti-ons, or to have the final deciſion of them referred to him.

3. *Lee*, Archbiſhop of *York*, who ſubſcribed the Anſwers in the MS. died in the Year 1544 * ſome Years before *Edward* was King, by which Argument (Dr. *Durel* ſays) he convinced Mr. *Still.* that the Convention was held at *Windſor* in the Reign of *Hen.* VIII. not of *Edward* VI.

* *Goodw. de Preſ. Eccl. Anglicanæ.*

4. In Mr. *Strype*'s Memor. the King makes his Animadverſi-ons upon the Biſhops Anſwers, which cannot be thought the Work of *Edw.* VI. a Child, but of *Hen.* VIII.

Mem. App. ubi ſupra.

5. The matter of the Queſtions, and of the Anſwers of *Cran-mer* ſufficiently prove that *Hen.* VIII. convened that Aſſembly at *Windſor*. They both reſemble the foreſaid *King's and Biſhops Books*, and one Animadverſion of the King in Mr. *Strype* (which is, *ſince they confeſs appointing Biſhops belongeth now to Princes, how can you prove that Ordering is only committed unto you Biſhops?*) be-wrays King *Henry*'s aſpiring to be inveſted with all the Spiritual and Eccleſiaſti-call Power, even of Ordination it ſelf. Of which, ſee more in his Memorials. *P.* 16, 17. *Append. N.* 7. *It. Mem.* 141. Briefly as in his elder Brothers life time, he was bred up in Learning, that he might be *Alterius Orbis Papa*, or Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*; ſo after he was King, the Ambition ſtill prevailed in him, and was not, we ſee, eaſily removed.

6. Early in the Reign of *Edw.* VI. and when the Reformation was going on proſperouſly, *Cranmer* and the Proteſtant Biſhops underſtanding matters better, and having freedom to ſpeak their Minds, delivered themſelves more clearly in the point, as may be inferred from ſundry Obſervations belonging to that Time, and upon Record. As

1. It

1. It is declared in the Preface before the Form of Ordination drawn up and agreed upon in *Edw.* VI's Reign. "That it is evident unto all Men, diligently "reading the Holy Scriptures, and ancient Authors, that from the Apoſtles "time there have been theſe Orders of Miniſters in Chriſt's Church, Biſhops, "Prieſts and Deacons, by publick Prayer, and with Impoſition of Hands ap- "proved and admitted thereunto. *Cranmer* it ſeems was now come over to Dr. *Leighton's* Opinion, declared in the days of *Hen.* VIII.

2. *Cranmer* ſet forth a Catechiſm in the firſt Year of *Edw.* VI. *Anno* 1548. wherein the three Orders are taught as of Divine Right, from whence (ſays the Hiſtorian) "It appears "that he had changed the Opinion he formerly held againſt "the Divine Inſtitution of thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Orders. *Burnet's Abr.* l. 2. p. 57. 58.

3 In the Days of *Edward* VI. *Cranmer* ſuſpended *Heath* Biſhop of *Worceſter*, for refuſing to ſubſcribe the fore-mentioned Form of Ordination.

4. In the ſame Reign *John Alaſco*, a Noble *Polonian*, was by *Cranmer's* means made a Superintendant over all the Churches of the Foreigners, yet newly planted in and about *London*; the *Germans*, *Italians*, and the *French*. —— And Superintendant is but another Word for Biſhop. *Strype's Mem.* p. 234, 237, 239, 241.

Whoever therefore will impartially weigh the darkneſs of the times in *Henry* VIII's Reign, where the above mentioned *King's and Biſhop's Books* were written, and the Anſwers made unto the King's Queſtions by *Cranmer*, and ſome others, the ſtifneſs of that Prince, his fondneſs of being Head of the Church, and the awe which the Archbiſhop and his Aſſociates in the Reformation ſtood in towards him, the earneſt deſire they had at any Rate, and on any Terms to be rid of the Pope's Tyranny, the falſeneſs, uncertainty, and abſurdity of many Opinions delivered by the Biſhops, and their repugnancy to each other; he will be forc'd to confeſs that no ſtreſs can be laid upon any of their Concluſions, much leſs that they were the firſt and ſteady Sentiments of the Proteſtant Church of *England*: For even the Popiſh Clergy alſo generally ſubſcribed them. But the ſudden alteration of the Biſhops minds as to this preſent Point in debate in *Edward* VI's days: puts it out of all queſtion, that the MS. of my late Lord of *Worceſter*, belongs to King *Henry* VIII's days; and that our firſt Reformers their mature and ſetled Judgment was, that there were from the beginning of the Chriſtian Church three Orders of Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters by Divine Right, Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons: Let us hear the Reflections of the Learned Prelate, the now Lord Biſhop of *Saliſbury*. *Hiſt. Reflect.* l. 3. p. 289. —— *"In *Cranmer's* Papers ſome ſingular Opinions of his about "the nature of Eccleſiaſtical Offices will be found; but as they "are delivered by him with all poſſible Modeſty, ſo they "were not eſtabliſhed as the Doctrine of the Church, but laid aſide as particu- "lar Conceits of his own. And it ſeems, that afterwards he changed his Opi- "nion; for he ſubſcribed the Book that was ſoon after ſet forth, which is di- "rectly contrary to thoſe Opinions ſet down in this Paper, *viz.* Mr. *Stillingfleet's* "MS. * *Abr.* b. 1. p. 250.

In the next Reign 'tis no matter to us what became of the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy. The Proteſtant Church of *England* ſuffered an Eclipſe in Queen *Mary's* days, but ſoon recovering it ſelf under the Auſpicious Government of

Queen *Elizabeth* ſhin'd ſo much the brighter, and in a ſhort time came to that Settlement which it enjoys to this day, without any conſiderable Alteration: And to our preſent point, note,

1. That the Form of Ordination of Deacons, Prieſts and Biſhops, with the Preface before ſpoken of, were confirmed in the 4th of *Eliz.* 1562. and again in her 13th Year *Anno* 1571. and which to make ſhort work of it, continues in force unto this Day.

2. In the general Apology of the Proteſtants, the 5th Article of the *Engliſh* Confeſſion is inſerted, and was drawn up in that Queen's time, *Anno* 1562. and runs in the words following, —"Farthermore, we believe that there be divers Degrees of Miniſters in the Church, Deacons, Prieſts and Biſhops, to whom is committed the Office to inſtruct the People, and ſetting forth of Religion.

Plea p.118.

But Mr. *O.* Objects unto us the 13th of *Eliz.* c. 12. pretending to prove thereby, that Ordination by Presbyters was then allowed here in *England*. The Clauſe he refers to, is more at length thus — "All Perſons under Biſhops, who pretend to be Prieſts, or Miniſters of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, by reaſon of any other Form of Inſtitution, or Conſecration, or Ordering, than the Form ſet forth by Parliament in *Edw.* VI. or now uſed, ſhall in the preſence of the Biſhop declare their Aſſent, and ſubſcribe to all the Articles of Religion, which only concern the Confeſſion of the true Chriſtian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments comprized in a Book, Entituled, *Articles agreed to by the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy, in Convocation* Anno 1562. *for avoiding diverſities of Opinions, &c.* —— *and ſhall, &c.* From hence Mr. *O.* infers, "That the Statute reſpects not Popiſh Ordinations, only, if at all, but gave Indulgence to thoſe that were not ſatisfied to ſubſcribe all the Articles abſolutely, among which was the Book of Conſecration; and that the Statute requires Subſcription only to the Doctrine of true Chriſtian Faith, and of the Sacraments, which he would prove in that the Statute ſpeaks of *Miniſters* of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, and the Title of *Miniſters* is rarely uſed among the Papiſts, and is common among the Reformed Churches; the Miniſtry among the Papiſts being a real Prieſt-hood, and therefore they call their Presbyters, Prieſts.

Anſ. The Statute, doubtleſs, ſpeaks of all Prieſts and Miniſters, whether Papiſts, or Diſſenters: All were to Aſſent and Subſcribe, in caſe they would continue in, or be let into any Eccleſiaſtical Promotion: But chiefly the Papiſts. For firſt, I aſſert this upon Mr. *O*'s own words. —— *The Miniſtry of the Papiſts* (ſays he) *was a real Prieſt-hood, and therefore they call their Presbyters, Prieſts.* On the contrary, I do not remember that Diſſenting Miniſters have ever been ſtiled Prieſts in any publick Inſtrument of Church or State. Now as for the word *Miniſters*, even that alſo (it may be) points at the Popiſh Prieſts; for it had lately been uſed among the Papiſts. I meet with it in *Smith*'s Recantation †; in the *neceſſary Doctrine*, and other publick Records. But chiefly, I conſider that at the time of this *Act* of Parliament the Popiſh Prieſts herded themſelves among the Diſſenters, and went by the name, and under the diſguiſe of Diſſenting *Miniſters*. For the more effectual diſcovery of theſe Foxes, and to unkennel them for the ſecurity of the

† *Recant.* p. 171.

Flock,

Flock, as well as to curb the Diſſenters themſelves, *Miniſters* was thought a fit Word to be added unto the *Act*, to the end none might eſcape ſubſcribing. Mr. *O*'s Maxime here turns upon himſelf, whilſt he diſtinguiſhes, where the Law does not, contrary to that wiſe rule of Interpreting Laws. Beſides, theſe Words in the Statute——*Who pretend to be Prieſts or Miniſters by reaſon of any other form of Inſtitution or Conſecration or ordering than the* Engliſh *then in force* do in my Opinion, plainly and more openly ſtrike at the Popiſh Ordinations, the Great Deſign of that Reign, eſpecially in the beginning, being to extirpate the *Romiſh* Prieſts.

It may be urg'd—" That the Diſſenting Miniſters by ſubſcribing thoſe Arti-
" cles, which only belong unto the Confeſſion of the true Chriſtian Faith, were
" to be admited or continued in their Benefices, and by conſequence their Ordi-
" nations allowed, though they did not declare their Aſſent unto the Ceremo-
" nies and Traditions, nor to the 20th and 36th Article of Religion.

Anſ. This cannot be: For I ſhall ſhew anon that they were oblig'd to ſubſcribe thoſe two Articles, which if they did *ex animo*, they muſt of neceſſity forthwith enter into Epiſcopal Orders, and approve of and uſe Church Ceremonies, which was what the Statute aim'd at.

Nor (as Mr. *O.* argues) does the ſubſcription ſeem to intend thoſe only, who ſcrupled Traditions and Ceremonies, and not the other Doctrines in the 39. Articles, which was the caſe of the Diſſenters alone. For the Papiſts ſcruple, many other of the 39. Articles, which alſo were to be aſſented unto, but were not ſcrupled by the Presbyterian Diſſenters (though other Diſſenting Miniſters haply did); and though the Papiſts ſcruple not Ceremonies and Traditions in General, yet they ſcruple ours in particular: By conſequence were intended in the Act, as much and more then the Diſſenters.

Mr. *O.* " Becauſe the Aſſent and Subſcription was only to the Articles of Re-
" ligion concerning the Confeſſion of the true Chriſtian Faith, and Doctrine of
" the ſacraments, therefore an Indulgence was intended the Diſſenting Miniſters,
" who ſcrupled nothing elſe but Ceremonies and the Book of Conſecration
" which belonging not to the Chriſtian Faith, are not required to be ſubſcribed
" and aſſented to, and by conſequence Ordination by Presbyters was here
" allowed.

Anſ. All I have to do is to prove that the 20th and 36th Articles among the 39. were by this Statute required to be ſubſcribed and aſſented to. And thus I prove it. 'Tis manifeſt that the 39 Articles are meant in this Statute, *viz.* from " theſe Words in the Act——" Articles agreed to by the Archbiſhops and Biſhops
" of both Provinces, and the Whole Clergy in Convocation *Anno* 1562. for
" avoiding diverſities of Opinions in Religion. Oh! but (*cries* Mr. *O.*) 'tis meant of tuch Articles only, as concerned *the Confeſſion of the true Chriſtian Faith*, which the two aforeſaid Articles did not; all the reſt being oppoſed (it ſeems) unto the 20th and 36th Articles.

Anſ. It is very abſur'd in my Judgment to Interpret Acts of Parliament in ſo looſe a manner, which are wont to ſpeak more correctly, and with greater exactneſs; and if this had been intended the Statute would certainly have excepted the two Articles. I rather believe the Articles of Religion here mentioned, are oppoſed to other Articles of the Queen's ſetting forth in the

* *Sp. Coll.* p. 123. 124. 125. &c.

the 6th of her Raign, *Anno* 1564. and to be ſeen in the Collection of Dr. *Sparrow* * called, "Articles for Doctrine and "Preaching, for Adminiſtration of Prayer and Sacraments, for "certain Orders in Eccleſiaſtical Politie, Apparel of Perſons "Eccleſiaſtical, and Sundry other Proteſtations. All which were injoined by the Queens Letters and Authority *only*, unto which this Statute did not direct an Aſſent and Subſcription, but to the 39 only. which for Diſtinctions ſake are entituled *Articles of Religion*, and in Alluſion thereto are ſo called in the Statute. To all theſe 39 Articles called *Articles of Religion*, all Prieſts and Miniſters were to ſubſcribe: And this was enacted as well for *the avoiding diverſity of Opinions, as eſtabliſhing of Conſent touching true Religion.*

Moreover by Ceremonies we commonly underſtand things of meer Humane or Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution: Theſe indeed conſidered every one ſingly by it ſelf belong not to the true Chriſtian Faith. Right! But the 20th Article, which in general defines and declares it to be in the Power of the Church to appoint ſome decent Ceremonies contains a Principle or Propoſition, which belongs unto the true Chriſtian Faith, as being founded on the Word of God, and therefore with the reſt was to be ſubſcrib'd.

The Book of Conſecration confirmed in the 36th Article, contains the Scripture Rule of Ordination by Biſhops, and ſo concerns the true Chriſtian Faith: It was then to be aſſented unto. Finally, that I have not miſtaken the Senſe of the Statute or the Lawgivers Intendment, I will ſupport my Interpretation by the Judgment of the great Oracle of the Law, and other Reverend Judges before him. "Subſcription required of the "Clergy is twofold: One by force of an Act of Parliament "confirming, and Eſtabliſhing the 39 Articles of Religion, "agreed upon at a Convocation of the Church of *England*, and "ratify'd by Queen *Eliz.* c. 12. referring to Canons made "by the Clergy of *England*, at a Convocation holden at *London*, 1562. containing 39 Articles of Religion, and ratify'd as aforeſaid——He adds, that in "*Smith*'s Caſe, who ſubſcribed the 39 Articles of Religion with this Addition—"*So far forth as the ſame were agreeable to the Word of God*, it was reſolved by *Wray* "Chief Juſtice, and all the Judges of *England*, that this ſubſcription was not "according to the Statute of the 13 *Eliz.* becauſe the Statute required an abſolute ſubſcription; that this Statute was made for avoiding Diverſity of Opinions, which was the ſcope of the Act, but by this Addition, the Party "might by his own private Opinion, take ſome of them to be againſt the "Word of God. Contrary to the deſign of the Statute, and the 39 Articles themſelves: Beſike *Smith* intended to decline, ſubſcribing unto the 20th and 36th Articles. Hereby then 'tis apparent, that this Act intended no indulgence unto the Diſſenters, nor allowance of Presbyterian Orders.

Cook's *Inſti.* Part 4. p. 323. *Tit. of Subſcription.*

In King *James* the firſt's Reign, was publiſh'd a Book entituled *Tractatus de Politia Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ*, by Dr. *Mocket* the then Archbiſhop's Chaplain, whereunto the Author annex'd *Jewels* Apology, the greater and leſs Catechiſms, the Publick *Liturgy*, the 39 Articles of Religion and the Homilies. Now becauſe *Blondel* builds upon theſe, I ought at leaſt to examine the Treatiſe and the Catechiſms. The latter, I cannot get a ſight of, and ſhall at preſent only look into the former, from whence it may be Collected——" That the Office of a Biſhop is twofold.

" twofold. The firſt has reſpect unto all the Faithful of the Whole Flock: The
" ſecond unto the Miniſters of the Church. As to the former it is acknowledged
" that Biſhop and Presbyter are the ſame Degree of Office or Order, or call it
" what you pleaſe. For the Presbyters Miniſter unto the People as effectually,
" as the Biſhops in all the Offices and Conveyances of Divine Grace: And on this
" account are the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, as much as the Biſhops are. The
" Presbyters Adminiſter the Sacraments, Preach the Word, interpret Scripture,
" reprove, exhort, incourage, and comfort, publiſh and declare Authoritative-
" ly, and Miniſterially the promiſe of the Remiſſion of Sin, and Eternal Life by
" Jeſus Chriſt, not only in the Sermons, but after Solemn Confeſſion of Sin, and
" in the Viſitation of the Sick, and of ſuch as have been troubled in Mind and
" Conſcience. In ſhort, to them in the aforeſaid Adminiſtrations, appertains
" that Principal Gift and Commiſſion——*Receive the Holy Ghoſt: Whoſe Sins*
" *ye remit they are remitted*, &c. Thus far Biſhops and Presbyters are the ſame,
" or, as St. *Jerom* has it, *pene Idem gradus*. This is not to be doubted of: For
" ſo they the Presbyters are the ſame with the Apoſtles. But the peculiar and
" diſtinguiſhing Character, and Office of the Biſhop is to inſpect, Govern and
" Ordain Presbyters and ſucceeding Biſhops. On this account the Presbyter
" (as *Jerom* alſo ſpeaks) is *ſecundus gradus*. Thus much we own and freely con-
feſs, let our Adverſaries make the beſt of it they can. I do ſuppoſe the diffe-
rence and Preeminence, and Superiority of Biſhops from and over Prebyters,
and their Ordaining Power is ſufficiently cleared to have been the Doctrine of
the reformed Church of England from the beginning, though *Blondel* would
pick out of this Treatiſe ſomething to the Contrary, which is not my buſineſs
here to take to task.

Vid. Acta. Syn. Dor. in the Rem. of Mr. Jo. Hales of Eaton.

Laſtly, I ſhall only produce the Teſtimony of the *Engliſh* Divines in the Synod of *Dort* held 1618. 1619. The Biſhop of *Landaff*, *Joſeph Hall* (afterwards Biſhop of *Norwich*) *John Davenant*, and *Samuel Ward*, having approv'd all the Doctrines in the *Belgick* confeſſion except Three Heads concerning Eccleſiaſtical Orders proteſted——*That the Government of the* Engliſh *Churches by Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, was of Apoſtolical Inſtitution*. Particularly *Landaff* in a Speech ran through the three Heads or Chapters, and then entred this Proteſtation, *that there was not in the Apoſtles Times nor ever had been in the Church an Equality of Miniſters.*

From the whole I gather 1. That it has ever been the Judgment of the Proteſtant Church of *England* from the Reformation, that there was by the Scripture and ought to be an inequality of Miniſters, and that Biſhops are diſtinct from and Superiour to Presbyters.

2. That the Presbyterians and Particularly Mr. *O.* do a great injury unto the Memory of that Great Man Archbiſhop *Laud*, and through his ſides unjuſtly Wound all that defend and aſſert Divine right of Epiſcopacy, impeaching them of Novelty and altering the Doctrine of the Church. That Renowned Prelate came into Play, and became a Leader in this Church not till after all the Inſtances, which I have alledged in proof of the Divine Right of Biſhops: Even the Biſhop of *Landaff* and his *Engliſh* Colleagues at the Synod of *Dort* were not Inferior to him; nor was it in *Laud*'s Power to Influence their Opinions. He was not Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* till the

Year

Year 1633. not of St. *Davids*, till 1621. two Years after the Synod was broken up. It cannot therefore with Reaſon be thought, that theſe excellent Perſons, who aſſiſted at that Aſſembly, were led by the Noſe, or aw'd by the Authority of Dr. *Laud*. Nor do I find that he was any ways intereſted in their Deliberations, or that he ſent to them any Letters, or Diſpatches upon that, or indeed any other ſubject. It can hardly be believed, ſince ſo many of the *Calviniſtical* Points were then eſtabliſhed, doubtleſs, to the regret of this Prelate. Beſides, Dr. *Andrews* had before *Laud*, written a Book to prove the Divine Right of Biſhops, ſurely not ſway'd thereto by *Laud*, who was, or had been his Chaplain.

But to remove all the invidious Calumnies and Reproaches, that have been falſly laid upon that unfortunate Prelate, and the reſt, who before, and after him, have maintained the Divine Right of Biſhops, it were ſufficient to call to remembrance, that it was the Doctrine of *Ignatius*, whoſe Teſtimonies 'tis needleſs to repeat any more: alſo of St. *Cyprian*, *Jam pridem per omnes Provincias & Urbes Ordinati ſunt (Epiſcopi)* and what he means by his *jam pridem*, he explains elſewhere, *Sciam Epiſcopos plurimos Eccleſiis Dominicis in toto Mundo Divina dignatione præpoſitos.* Once more I read, *Cum hoc igitur (omnis Actus Eccleſiæ) per eoſdem Præpoſitos gubernetur divina lege fundamentum ſit.* Laſtly, of *Jerom* himſelf, *Conſtituit Chriſtus in omnibus finibus Mundi Principes Eccleſiæ*, which alſo he calls *Traditionem Apoſtolicam*, writing to *Evagrius*, which have been remembred before. Now if ſome of *Laud's* immediate Predeceſſors, or Contemporaries, can be produced (granting this) as being of another Mind, not ſeeing, or not openly confeſſing and conteſting the Truth, 'twas ſurely for want of Underſtanding, Courage, or Integrity. But why theſe failings and defects ſhould be laid in the balance with the undoubted Teſtimonies of the Fathers, or prejudice the Wiſdom and Faithfulneſs of others, yea the Publick and Authoritative Declarations of our Church too, is beyond my Capacity to comprehend. This is out of queſtion (I judge) that Presbyterian Ordination, the Identity and Parity of Biſhops and Presbyters, has never yet been pronounced lawful, much leſs of Divine Right, by any Publick and Authentick Sentence of the Church of *England*, ſince the Reformation except haply by that pack't Aſſembly of Divines, not one of whom were Legally choſe to ſit at *Weſtminſter*. Some private Writers may haply be found inclining to the Opinion, whereby Presbyters are equal'd unto Biſhops, and thought to be of the ſame Degree; but I make no reckoning of ſuch private Authorities, though they were otherwiſe Perſons of ſingular Learning, Wiſdom and Piety: And ſome Paſſages favouring the Presbyterian Pretences may poſſibly be found in the publick Deliberations and Concluſions, whilſt *Hen.* VIII. was Vindicating this Church from the Tyranny of the Pope, and in his ſtead aſſuming it to himſelf. Thus far we chang'd our Rider, not our Burthen; but it ought to be conſidered, that as in thoſe difficult times the Epiſcopal Power was ſubjected to the will of the Prince, and to the Law of the Land, and ſo may be thought not by Divine Right, but Humane Conſtitution; even ſo was the Power and Office of Perſons, Vicars and Prieſts, or Presbyters, and from thence alſo it follows with equal Force, that theſe alſo are but by Humane Law, and thence derive their Authority. Let us for example but look back unto *Cranmer's* Anſwer

S. *Cyp. Ep.* 55.
Id. Ep. 63.
Id. Ep. 33.
Jer. Com. in Pſ. 45.

to the King's 9th *Query*, and we may be convinced hereof. The ſubſtance of it
is —" That the whole care of the Church is immediately committed to the
" Prince. That Parſons, Vicars, and other Prieſts, were to be appointed by
" His Highneſs to their Miniſtrations. *To the* 10*th Query*, that the Prince may
" make a Prieſt. He that will infer hence, that according to the Doctrine of the
Church of *England* at that time, Biſhops were not *Jure Divino*, but by the Law
of the Land, muſt be alſo forced to conclude, that Prieſts and Miniſters hold
by the ſame Tenure and no other: And from the whole it will follow that Mr.
Hobbs was in the right, when he affirms the Will and Laws of the Prince to be
the Standard of the Peoples Religion. Furthermore, we are often confronted
with the Doctrine and Practice of the Foreign Proteſtant Churches, and called
upon to have a more favourable, charitable, and juſt Opinion of them, and
their Miniſtry. Hereunto it will ſuffice me only to anſwer with St. *Paul*, *What
have I to do to judge them that are without?* But I farther conſider with what Diffi-
culties they at firſt ſtruggled, and ſtill labour under, and am apt to think that
the ſame good God that would have *Mercy, and not Sacrifice*, and ſo diſpenſed
with his own appointed Sabbath, may (and I hope) will accept their Sacrifices,
though they be not *prepared according to the purification of the ſanctuary*. I alſo con-
ſider that the Foreign Proteſtants are by this time, (many of them, even the
moſt Learned) quite Captivated by a long Prejudice, which the continuance of
the Presbyterian Government among them for ſo many Years, ſince the Refor-
mation has now perhaps, rendred unconquerable, and that therefore God may
(and I hope does) wink at this Ignorance; for ſuch I reckon an inveterate Pre-
judice to be. Beſides, though many of the Foreign Proteſtant Miniſters have
Zealouſly defended the Presbyterian Government, and ſeem not at all willing,
or inclined to Model themſelves into the Epiſcopal Platform, though it were in
their power, and opportunity ſerved; yet others of them have been contrary
minded, and even in the midſt of that darkneſs, wherein they lay, have been
able do diſcover the Truth, which ſhined through the Clouds of their Hard-
ſhips and Prepoſſeſſions. I will not here mention the *French* Letters written un-
to the preſent Honourable, and Right Reverend Biſhop of *London*. Mr. O. has
moſt maliciouſly Suggeſted as if the Authors were Brib'd, or by ſome indirect means
induc'd to write as they did. I do not know upon what Authority he has pub-
liſhed this ſcandalous ſurmize, and if it had been fit to take up Reports by
Conjecture, or uncertain Fame meerly to blaſt the Credit of a Writer, I could
have told him e'er now, what I have heard (from one who was no
ſtranger to the Presbyterian Intregues in 1640. and ſo on, and may be pre-
ſumed to ſpeak what he had opportunity to know, *&c.*) that Mounſieur *Blondel* came
into *England*, with hopes to be preferred in our Church by Archbiſhop *Laud*,
but it ſeems miſt his aim: That he was afterwards hired by the Presbyterians to
write for them againſt Epiſcopacy. Thus Revenge and the Love of Money
were the Parents of that Celebrated Book entituled——*Apologia pro Hiero-
nymi Sententia*; And Laſtly, that even in the Apology its ſelf ſome things were
intermixed, which undid and overthrew all he ſeemed to have advanced in de-
fence of Presbytery: Which therefore he was forced to expunge before he re-
covered the Promiſed Reward of his Labour. But after this let us now hear
what a Learned Proteſtant, a Foreign Divine has written upon this Subject, I mean
Peter Du Moulin, in a Letter to a *Scotch* Man *Anno* 1640. He ſays——" That
" the

“the *French* Proteſtant Church never put down Biſhops (p. 6.) nor encouraged others to do it: That neceſſity not Choice keeps 'em from ſetting up Epiſcopal Order: That at *Geneva*, where Epiſcopacy was changed into the Presbyterian Form, neceſſity bore more ſway than Council, and Policie than Divinity: That the Reformation in *France* began among the People, in *Scotland* (and *England*) at Court: No wonder then that due Regard was not had unto the Primitive Government in the one as well as the other, that the *French* Proteſtants have much ado to maintain their Miniſters by reaſon of their Poverty: That if they ſhould eſtabliſh Biſhops, it would provoke their Adverſaries and raiſe them to Jealouſy, and moreover would look more like direct Schiſm, two Biſhops being at the ſame time in one See: That they are a Body prepar'd for Biſhops, when Biſhops will reform: He gives an Inſtance, that ſomewhere the Biſhop in his Cathedral preach'd the pure Word of God, and the Proteſtants ſubmitted to him. He farther Apologizes, that their King will not ſuffer them to have Biſhops. I only add, hereunto Biſhop *Hall's* Obſervation, how that, when our Biſhop of *Landaff* at the Synod of *Dort*, charg'd the Diviſions there (in *Holland*) upon their want of Epiſcopacy he received this only in Anſwer —*Domine nos non ſumus adeo fœlices.* Whether this was ſpoken by way of Modeſt excuſe, and a tacit approbation of Biſhops, I know not of certaitny; but believe ſo; at leaſt I look upon it as a ſhifting off the Queſtion about Epiſcopacy the Preſident not caring to enter into the Liſts with the Biſhop upon that Argument. But if he intended it (as perhaps Mr. *O.* will think) for a Scoff, I will take the Liberty to ſay, that as the High-Prieſt propheſied a great Truth but intended it not, neither underſtood it; ſo might the Preſident too ſtumble upon a great Truth, and intimate Epiſcopacy to be the Happineſs of a Church, tho' at the ſame time he was otherwiſe perſwaded or did not diſcern it. For there are a ſort of Creatures, which cannot endure the Light, and by how much clearer the Sun ſhines ſee ſo much the worſe: Like *Saul* going to *Damaſcus* before his Converſion, are ſtruck blind with the Glory and Luſtre of Truth which ſurrounds them. This we are aſſured of by manifold and wofull Experience, and therefore need not wonder at it. The Eyes of the Underſtanding labour under the ſame natural Weakneſs, as thoſe of the Body do. When we have continued long in the dark or have ſhut our Eyes for ſomewhile, we are not able to behold the Objects of Senſe, though placed at their proper diſtance, and in a Medium duly fitted for their Reception. Thus when Pride, Wilfulneſs and Prepoſſeſſion, when Paſſion, Sturdineſs and Secular Intereſt, when contentiouſneſs Oppoſition, and Hatred have for ſome time drawn a veil over the Underſtanding, it is not eaſy for theſe Men to admit any Notions, that thwart and contradict thoſe, which they have for a long time before entertained, let the Evidence brought for their Conviction be never ſo bright and clear. For inſtance, Mr. *O.* as has been noted in the former Chapter has frankly acknowledged it as fit and warrantable, that ſome Grave Divines be ſet over the Churches for Peace and Order ſake, whilſt the Younger ſort are for the preſent to be excluded or ſuſpended from the exerciſe of their Inherent Power. Now Mr. *O.* is not able (I perceive) to ſee, that this very reaſonable Conceſſion of his, if rightly purſu'd and improved as it ought; puts an end unto the Controverſy. For though he has ſo frequently and unreaſon-

Div. Right of Epiſco. p. 9.

ably

ably at every turn declared againſt Eccleſiaſtical Reſtraints, yet here he allows
'em, and ſuppoſes it in the Power of the Church to reſtrain ſome from the exer-
ciſe of their Power, and to reſerve the Cheif care and Government of the
Church, to a few of the moſt Eminent. Here I ſay, then the Cudgels are in effect laid
down, and Epiſcopacy is ſufficiently vindicated and approved of by the Adverſa-
ry himſelf, though before he is aware. No! it will be replyed; for ſtill care
muſt be taken, that it be not however admitted, as of Divine Right. Well!
But if an Eccleſiaſtical Right be ſufficient to oblige us unto Obedience to our Su-
periors (as in the conceſſion its ſelf he muſt ſuppoſe) then have our Reverend
Biſhops a good Title to their own Power, and to our ſubjection to 'em. Beſides,
how eaſy is it to improve this Conceſſion even to the Vindication of the Divine
Right of Biſhops? For if Mr. *O.* (who, when he ſuffers himſelf to think, is, I
am hereby convinc'd, a Wiſe Man, and ſees far before Him) will but turn him-
ſelf about and look the other way, that is behind him: I mean, will but admit St.
Paul and the Apoſtles heretofore to have been as wiſe as himſelf is now, it would
be no hard matter (one would imagine) to convince him preſently of the Divine,
that is, Apoſtolical Conſtitution of Biſhops. If it is now, it was alſo in
the Apoſtles Days fit, and reaſonable to commit the care and Government of
the Churches unto ſome Grave and Worthy Presbyters: And if ſo, can we
poſſibly believe the Apoſtles did not appoint what their own Reaſon and Prudence
ſuggeſted to them?

But let us paſs to another Inſtance. Mr. *Stoddon* in his Paſto-
ral Charge, has confeſſed* that there were Rulers in the *Paſt.Charge.
Church, who were not Teachers, as appears plainly to me (ſays p. 105, 108.
he) from 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. although I ſuppoſe the power of Preach-
ing was committed to them. Something of this kind I have in the precedent
Papers offered my ſelf, and could farther confirm it out of Mr. *Mede*, if it were
worth the while and ſuited my Deſign. But Mr. *Stoddon* a-
gain diſtinguiſhes between what is primarily, and what is *ſecon-* *Id.* p. 106.
darily jure Divino, as Biſhop *Sanderſon* long before him has done:
And to be ſhort, is of Opinion that the Clergy has as much need to have a Go-
vernour ſet over them as the Common People themſelves, and that if the Scri-
pture has not expreſly appointed it, yet the reaſon and neceſſity of the thing
does abſolutely require it, or to this effect (for at preſent I have not the Book
by me): And ſurely the Apoſtles knew this and by Experience too, as well as
Mr. *Stoddon*. Now I cannot comprehend what ſhould hinder this Gentleman
coming over to us, but the inveterate Prejudices, which he cannot part with, or
a ſtiffneſs and averſion to change his Opinions, for which his Old Friends would
be ſure to reproach him without Mercy. In a word, then 'tis to very little pur-
poſe to pretend by the dint of Argument to make Proſelites. One may happily
comfort incourage and confirm ſome in the Truth, which they already know and
profeſs; But to convert any, there are very little hopes, ſeeing moſt Men have
an overweening Opinion of themſelves, and the Party which they have eſpous'd.
There I leave them, not expecting they will be reclaim'd from the evil of their
way, till God ſhall open their Eyes, and by ſome ſecret and powerfull Influence
diſpoſe their Hearts unto the knowledge and acknowledgment of the Truth,
or elſe by ſome viſible Judgments and Afflictions conſtrain us unto Unity, which
is the only thing ſome Men are afraid of. They have not ſtuck to declare,
that

that an Agreement would certainly deſtroy the Liberties of the People, and introduce Tyranny among us: A Paradox, which Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles were perfect Strangers to, and which all Good Men I hope do utterly abhor. But pray we for the Peace of *Jeruſalem*: They ſhall proſper that love it: Peace be between it's Walls and Plenteouſneſs within its Palaces: And if there be any Man that is not a Son of Peace, let him be *Anathema Maran-atha.*

ADDENDA *to the* 19th *Chapter.*

THere is an Objection which eſcaped me in its proper place, and therefore muſt here be conſidered, *viz. that Presbyterian Orders have been allowed here in* England, *that* Peter Martyr, Bucer, P. Fagius, &c. *were ſuffered to exerciſe their Miniſtry among us.*

Anſ. 1. Allowances againſt an Eſtabliſh'd Law are not very defenſible, eſpecially when that Law was believed to be of Divine Right, which is the Caſe here before us of Ordination by Biſhops, let this then be put among the Infirmities and miſtakes of our firſt Reformers. 2. Our firſt Reformers might think it juſtifiable in Charity to Foreign Proteſtant Churches, which had not the opportunity of Epiſcopal Ordination; the preſent neceſſities and Service of the Church required it: The Reformation otherwiſe would have received ſome ſtop or Prejudice by bringing this Point into Controverſy. For ſome ſuch like Reaſon as this it was, that the Church of *England* in the Reign of K. *James* I. ſent Delegates unto the Synod of *Dort*, and contented her ſelf after the Concluſions there made only to enter her Proteſtations againſt the Parity of Miniſters. 3. Our firſt Reformers haply went upon this Principle, *He that is not againſt us is for us*, and ſuch were *Peter Martyr, Bucer, Fagius, &c.* But our Diſſenters were always *againſt us*, making it their whole buſineſs to overturn the Eccleſiaſtical Government of this Nation by railing, and reviling and repreſenting it as Popiſh and Anti-Chriſtian. 4. The Indulgence ſpoken of had in it perhaps more of State Policy than true Divinity, and is to be reckon'd as the Act of the Civil Government rather, than of the Church. Thus the *Dutch* and *Hugonot* Miniſters have ever even to this day been permitted to Officiate in Divine Things without Epiſcopal Orders. 5. All theſe Indulgences do not amount to the deſtroying the Truth of that Principle concerning the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy. Foraſmuch as the Relaxation of the Execution of a poſitive Law cannot in Reaſon be accounted the annulling or abolition of that Law, as we ſee at this Day, when Liberty is given to the very Dregs of Enthuſiaſtical and Fanatical Sectaries, which is no more Prejudice unto Epiſcopacy, than 'tis to other acknowledg'd Truths of the Goſpel. 6. As for thoſe particular Perſons allowed to exerciſe their Miniſtry here in *England* we may note, that *Peter Martyr* was in Epiſcopal Orders, and it may be others of them were alſo. But there is a ſtory which I am obliged to take notice of becauſe Mr. *B.* my

firſt

firſt Adverſary objected it to us. He affirmed, *the Proteſtant Biſhops of England formerly approved of Presbyterian Ordination*, as he inferred from a Paſſage about the Ordination of Biſhop *Spotſwood* and Others. The Caſe was this.

" In the Year 1609 ſome *Scotchmen* were to be Ordained Bi-
" ſhops, and a Synod was held by our *Engliſh* Biſhops for that
" purpoſe, Dr. *Andrews* Biſhop of *Ely* ſaid, that they ought firſt
" to be Ordained Presbyters as having not been Ordained by
" Biſhops but by Presbyters *only*. *Bancroft* Archbiſhop of *C.* maintained, that
" there was no neceſſity of that, becauſe where Biſhops could not be had Ordi-
" nation though by Presbyters (*only*,) muſt be eſteemed lawful, elſe it might be
" doubted, whether there was any lawful Vocation in moſt of the Reformed
" Churches. This applauded to by the other Biſhops, *Ely* acquieſc'd.

Spots. Hiſt. of Sc. p. 514. 3d *Edit.*

From hence I inferr, not that the Proteſtant Biſhops of *England* approved of Presbyterian Ordination, but that in the Judgment of this *Engliſh* Synod, nothing but neceſſity can juſtify it; now what Degree of neceſſity is requiſite, I'll not here diſpute. 2. That where Epiſcopal Ordination may be had there Presbyterian Ordination is unlawful. 3. That the neceſſity here pleaded in Defence of Presbyterian Orders impplies, that Epiſcopal Ordination is of Divine Right: otherwiſe it had been impertinent to excuſe Presbyterian Ordination, only from the neceſſity of it.

But I crave leave to interpoſe my own Judgment, and I humbly conceive there was no need of flying unto this Refuge of neceſſity, for ſtill the Ordination of theſe *Scotch* Gentlemen might have proceeded, *Salvo etiam Epiſcopalis Ordinationis Jure Divino*; for I do affirm that by the practice of the Church a Layman may be immediately elevated into the Throne, and effectually receive the Epiſcopal Character without being firſt Ordained Deacon and Prieſt. This latter is indeed more ſafe and regular in Ordinary: Nevertheleſs in extraordinary Caſes, the former has been practiſed. Thus the Learned Dr. *Cave* has obſerved, that Monks were wont to be made Biſhops without going through the uſual intermediate Orders of the Church. He inſtances in *Serapion*, *Apollos*, *Agathus*, *Ariſton*, &c. mentioned by St. *Athan. Tom.* 1. *p.* 957. However this be I ſhall produce two notable and unqueſtionable inſtances of it.

Prim. Chriſtianity.

The firſt is of *Nectarius* P. C. He being but a *Catechumen*, *i. e.* an unbaptized Chriſtian (if I may ſo ſay) one of the *Senatorian* Order, and a Prætor was nominated and Choſen Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, when *Greg. Nazianzen* had abdicated it, and immediately after Baptiſm was Ordained Biſhop without the intermediate Orders of Deacon or Presbyter.

Soc. E. H. l. 5. c. 8. p. 265.
Soz. l. 7. c. 8. p. 713. 714.

The other is of St. *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Millain*. He alſo a *Catechumen* only, and at that time the Conſular Governour of the Province was choſen, and after Baptiſm Ordained Biſhop thereof without the intermediate Orders of Deacon or Presbyter: For a Biſhop according to St. *Chryſoſtom's* Maxim ὅλον τὸ [illegible] has in him the whole Miniſterial Power. I alledge this principally with this Deſign to Vindicate the ſucceſſion of the *Scotch* Epiſcopal Ordinations.

Soc. l. 4. c. 30.
Theod. l. 4. c. 7. c. 19.

The End.

ERRATA.

PART I.

PAge 3. line 17. read managing, l. 18. r. endeavour'd, p. 5. l. 9. r. Dioceſan, p. 6. l. 33. r. Epiſt. 2. v. 6. p. 12. l. 40. r. denoting, p. 13. l. *ult* r. deſignat, p. 15. l. 34. r, *the* for *that*, p. 23. l. 3. r. Angels, *ibid.* l. 37. after they add *are*, p. 24. l. 5. r. *Haggai. ibid.* l. 20. r. [illegible], *ibid.* l. 33. after *manner*, add *to be*, p. 28. l. 28. after *that*, add *they*, p. 32. l. 25. r. Months, p. 46. l. 2. r. Argument, p. 52. l. 3. r. conclude, p. 65. l. 25. r. Succeſſors, p. 67. l. 35. r. pretend, p. 73. l. 17. after *of*, add *the People*, p. 76. l. 15. r. *Gal.* 2. 9. p. 80. l. 5. r. Penance.

PART II.

PAge 21. line 7. read bold, p. 22. l. 38. r. Chriſtians, *ibid.* l. 45. for *no*, r. *do*, p. 42. l. 24. r. *Maximinus*, p. 45. l. 11. r. *Aſturica*, p. 51. l. 33. r. Council. p. 55. l. 26. r. Counterfeit. p. 59. l. 4. r. valid, *ibid.* l. 8. r. intrinſick, p. 62. l. 3. r. [illegible], *ibid.* l. 9. r. received, *ibid.* l. 11. dele *is*, *ibid.* l. 43. r. ordaining, p. 63. l. 15. r. *Iſchyras*, p. 74. l. 16. r. Adverſaries, p. 76. l. 26. for *this* r. *the*, p. 82. l. 35. dele *be*, p. 92. l. 23. r. Liberty, p. 102. l. 18. r. *Joannes*, *ibid.* l. 37. r. becauſe, p. 106. l. 37. r. diſlike, *ibid.* l. 43. r. out, p. 108. l. 3. r. ſufficient, p. 109. l. 2. r. divers, p. 110. l. 10. r. voluntary, p. 112. l. 35. dele *that*, l. 37. r. *ceteroſq;* p. 114. l. 28. r. Counſellors, p. 117. l. 32. after *days* dele : p. 119. l. 37. r. Biſhops, p. 123. l. 37. r. Intrigues, *ibid.* l. *ſeq.* r. opportunity, *ibid.* r. *Monſieur*.